DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 314 JC 750 354

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Einbecker, Polly Godwin |
| TITLE | Performance Objectives in Community Junior Colleges: A Study of Their Effect Upon Teaching and Learning at Pensacola Junior College and Their Use in Selected States. |
| PUB DATE | 75 |
| NOTE | 109p.; Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | Beginning Teachers; *Behavioral Objectives; College Faculty; Faculty Evaluation; *Junior Colleges; *Performance Based Education; State Agencies; State of the Art Reviews; *Statewide Planning; *Teacher Attitudes |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Pensacola Junior College |

ABSTRACT

In order to assess the status of the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in community colleges around the country, the author conducted a literature review and contacted state-level community college policy-making agencies in each state. Responses from 26 state agencies indicated that performance objectives are used for instructional purposes in many institutions nationwide, but that little consistency exists in directives or approaches. In order to assess the attitudes of the faculty of Pensacola Junior College (Florida) toward performance objectives, an Opinion Poll was sent to all 230 faculty members; 163 responded. Opinion Poll results indicated that (1) those faculty members holding the highest educational degrees tended to be least favorable toward performance objectives; and (2) those with the most teaching experience had the best knowledge and the best attitudes toward performance objectives, but held the lowest opinion of their use in faculty evaluation. In rank order from favorable to unfavorable opinion, the mean responses from six disciplines were as follows: Exact Science, Vocational-Technical, Language and Fine Arts, Adult Education, Health Related, and Social Science. Recommendations for the college, the faculty Opinion Poll with tabulated responses, and the letters from state agencies are appended. (DC)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED107314

# PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES:

## A Study of Their Effect Upon Teaching and Learning at Pensacola Junior College and Their Use in Selected States

by

Polly Godwin Einbecker

PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE

A Practicum Presented to Nova University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Education

Spring
1975

JC 750 354

ABSTRACT

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES:

A Study of Their Effect Upon Teaching and Learning
at Pensacola Junior College
and Their Use in Selected States

By

Polly Godwin Einbecker

The three purposes of this investigation were: 1) to review the literature relative to the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in instructional programs, 2) to determine what is happening around the country at state-level policy making agencies relative to the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in Community Junior College instructional programs, and 3) to determine the attitudes of Pensacola Junior College faculty toward the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program.

The review of literature has produced some information that might be helpful to Pensacola Junior College faculty members who are involved in preparing or upgrading performance objectives for their courses.

The responses to nationwide letters mailed to state-level Community Junior College planning agencies which requested information concerning the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in each state has supported the following empirical evidence: Even though performance objectives are used for instructional purposes

in varying degrees around the country, little consistency exists in directives, approaches, and solutions to the concept of performance-based education.

Of the fifty state-level agencies for Community Junior Colleges that were polled for this study, twenty-six responded. Only one, Nevada, definitely stated that performance objectives were not used in the Community College Division of that state. Seventeen states responded that performance objectives are used in varying degrees and because of numerous external pressures for accountability. Only four of these seventeen states, Delaware, Florida, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, suggested that the preparation and use of performance objectives in instructional programs resulted from a stated or implied state-level mandate.

To determine the attitudes of Pensacola Junior College faculty toward the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program, an Opinion Poll was developed and distributed to the total 230 Pensacola Junior College faculty population. Responses from 163 faculty members who complied with the request for information were included in this study. These data were used to determine the relationship existing between faculty attitudes toward performance objectives and 1) the six disciplines, 2) the number of degrees held, and 3) the number of years teaching experience.

The statistical procedures used in the treatment of data were MEAN comparison and simple correlation analysis. The Step-Wise Multiple Regression Program from the IBM Scientific Subroutine Package was used to determine the MEAN responses for each of the six disciplines and to determine the statistical relationship between the faculty attitudes and the number of degrees held and the relation-

ship between faculty attitudes and the number of years teaching experience.

On the basis of the data used and the resultant findings, it was concluded that the relationship existing between faculty attitudes and the six disciplines reflected in MEAN responses from each discipline was as follows:

1. In rank order from favorable to unfavorable attitudes relative to the use, preparation, and function of performance objectives, the disciplines line up as follows: Exact Science, Vocational-Technical, Language and Fine Arts, Adult Education, and Social Science.

2. In spite of unfavorable attitudes expressed, faculty members in each of the six disciplines indicated that they were more favorable toward performance objectives now than they were four years ago in 1970-71 when they were first required to write syllabuses and performance objectives for their courses.

3. Although the attitudes of PJC faculty members reflect diversified use, acceptance, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program, the results of this study reveal that most of the PJC faculty members were between a favorable and neutral position rather than between an unfavorable and neutral position.

The relationship existing between faculty attitudes and the number of degrees held resulted in negative correlations for each of the nineteen items on the Opinion Poll. Faculty members with a large number of degrees tended to give unfavorable (low) responses and faculty members with a fewer number of degrees tended to give favorable (high) responses. Responses to five of the Opinion Poll items resulted in negative correlations that were significant at the .05 level of confidence.

1. Faculty members who have master or doctorate degrees tended to rate their knowledge of performance objectives low; faculty members who have bachelor degrees tended to rate their knowledge of performance objectives high.

2. Faculty members who have master or doctorate degrees tended to rate their attitude toward performance objectives low; faculty members who have bachelor degrees tended to rate their attitude toward performance objectives high.

3. Faculty members who have master or doctorate degrees tended to give low ratings to the value of performance objectives in both improving the quality of skills being mastered by the students and in encouraging faculty to explore the use of methods, materials, and criterion measures; faculty members who have bachelor degrees tended to give high ratings to the value of performance objectives in both improving the skills being mastered by the students and in encouraging faculty to explore the use of methods, materials, and criterion measures.

The relationship existing between faculty attitudes and the number of years teaching experience resulted in positive correlations for four items on the Opinion Poll and in a negative correlation for one item on the Opinion Poll. These five correlations were significant at the .05 level of confidence.

1. Faculty members who have high number of years teaching experience tended to rate their knowledge of performance objectives high; faculty members who have low number of years teaching experience tended to rate their knowledge of performance objectives low.

2. Faculty members who have high number of years teaching experience tended to rate their attitude toward performance objectives high; faculty members who have low number of years teaching experience tended to rate their attitude toward performance objectives low.

3. Faculty members who have high number of years teaching experience tended to give low ratings to increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives; faculty members who have low years of teaching experience tended to give high ratings to increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| ABSTRACT | | iii |
| CHAPTER | | |
| I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II | BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE | 5 |
| | Are Performance Objectives Needed? | 5 |
| | What Are Performance Objectives? | 6 |
| | Must Educators Write Performance Objectives? | 7 |
| | How are Performance Objectives Written? | 8 |
| | Are Performance Objectives the Total Answer? | 9 |
| III | POLICY EFFECTING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN SELECTED STATES | 12 |
| IV | PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES: THEIR USE, ACCEPTANCE, AND FUNCTION IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AT PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE | 28 |
| | Purpose of Simple Correlation Study | 28 |
| | Procedure of Simple Correlation Study | 29 |
| V | RESULTS OF THE STUDY | 31 |
| VI | RECOMMENDATIONS | 39 |
| V | SUMMARY STATEMENT | 44 |
| REFERENCES | | 46 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| | A. Letter of Request for State-Level Planning Information Concerning the Preparation and Use of Performance Objectives | 48 |
| | B. Community Junior College State-Level Planning Agencies | 50 |
| | C. Status of Performance Objectives as Reported by Each State-Level Agency for Community Junior Colleges | 53 |
| | D. Pensacola Junior College Opinion Poll Instrument Used to Determine Faculty Attitudes Toward Performance Objectives | 87 |
| | E. Tables Reporting the Tabulated Results of Simple Correlation Study | 90 |
| | I - II Disciplines vs. Faculty Attitudes | 91 |
| | III - IV Degrees Held vs. Faculty Attitudes | 95 |
| | V - VI Years of Experience vs. Faculty Attitudes | 99 |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

"Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils, for time is the greatest innovator; and if time, of course, alters things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"

Francis Bacon

"The secret of success is constancy to purpose."

Disraeli

The dissatisfied consumers of education, students and constituents, are both a bane and a benefit. The student "finds himself encompassed by institutions inhumanistically oriented . . . bombarded with tests that departmentalize his abilities: stamped with neat packages of learning; plagued with puritan values. His protests, his rebellions thrust holes in the encapsulated structure of education and incite a quickening tempo to necessary change (Dessler, 1970, p. 174)."

The dissatisfied constituents of education focus on the problem of coping with an uncertain future where knowledge and the bewildering acceleration of the process of change is exploding exponentially. Warren Bennis (1969, p. 1) has written that "change is the biggest story in the world today, and we are not coping with it adequately." Can change be orderly and, if so, can it be planned for? For educational institutions, sense of direction is the issue and accountability is the mandate. If education is to cope with the challenge for change needed to meet burgeoning needs, educational policy systems must deal with

divergent and competitive sets of values, and policy making must be directed toward critical needs of all constituents:

1. The need for fundamental reform in the purpose and organization of our institutions, to enable education to adapt responsively to changing social, cultural, political, and economic environment,
2. The need to develop our institutions upon the premise of human value which permits the individual to retain his identity and integrity in a society increasingly characterized by centralized government, stern economic threats, and social maliase which seems to be shrinking the optimism of Toffler's man,
3. The need to recognize the egalitarian movement and the rising demand for social and political justice and freedom, particularly from deprived sectors of society.

Under these conditions where accountability is the supreme mandate, since educational institutions must be ruled by policy, though there is no clear concensus of what 'policy' is, educational institutions must in some way prove that there is, indeed, "orderliness in our chaos (Martorana, 1975)."

A concensus of educational research reported by Philip H. Coombs states that during the post-war years, especially after 1950, many individual community colleges and universities - and then whole states - began to plan education " . . . trying to see where they had been, where they were, where they should go, and how they could best get there (Harris, 1965, p. 105)." Coombs continued, 'We had no diagnostic frame of reference for education (Harris, 1965, p. 107)."

Francis A. J. Ianni explains some misguided efforts that have been made by educators in their search for direction as stated by Coombs: "Efforts directed toward progress in education have generally centered around providing more of what already exists - more classrooms, more books, more courses, more visual aids, and improving the preparation of

teachers, who are not fully using even the little that is already known (Harris, 1965, p. 123)."

This uncertain direction toward progress in education has experienced pressure for accountability. This pressure has logically necessitated that education become a measurable product. Of many attempts to satisfy accountability, one of the major attempts has been reflected in the nebulous term - performance objectives. Embraced as a panacea by many educators, feared as a threat by others, viewed as an enigma by some, opposed vehemently as a stereotype by the would-be aesthetician. Accepted, rejected, debated - although a constant controversial issue, performance objectives as a measure of accountability have demanded and received attention for the past decade.

The concept of stating performance objectives in terms of observable student behavior has been a concern of educators for many years. However, explicitly written statements of performance objectives, a 1970-71 requirement for many Florida educators, has revealed interesting conflicts from those educators who have undertaken the project of writing and using performance objectives for their disciplines.

There seems to be general agreement among research efforts that a performance objective should state: 1) an observable, measurable student behavior, 2) the conditions under which student performance is observed, and 3) the criterion for judging student performance. However, the how-to-do-it involved with writing clear statements which explicitly describe performance objectives for each discipline has revealed that educators need guidance in identifying, analyzing, and constructing performance objectives. Writing explicit performance objectives and determining which person, group, or agency could issue and enforce the mandate that educators write performance objectives has caused much of the con-

sternation. Although attention is focused upon this measure of accountability in policy making throughout the nation, little consistency is found in the efforts to cope with the issue.

This paper proposes to investigate meager, uncertain policy that mandates, accelerates, or decelerates the movement toward performance objectives. To complement this effort which attempts to examine existing or projected policy, the paper will further direct itself to performance objectives in the following three ways:

1. To report utilitarian information for the preparation and use of performance objectives from published researchers,
2. To report happenings around the nation, in selected states pro and con, in the preparation and use of performance objectives, which agencies are accelerating or decelerating the movement, some resulting impact, and
3. To report specific attitudes toward the use, acceptance, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program at Pensacola Junior College as reflected in an opinion poll of Pensacola Junior College faculty and administrators.

## CHAPTER II

## BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

### Performance Objectives: Knowin' Where You're Goin'

An old maxim, "There is no road to success but through clear, strong purpose," would substantiate the need for education to state a purpose and to determine when that purpose has been met. The issues are goals and a sense of direction.

### Performance Objectives: Are they needed?

In response to this need for sense of direction, administrators and teachers are trying to plan a curriculum with purpose to involve the student in his own process of learning. "Performance objectives bring immediacy to the learning process. With them for reference, the student no longer has to be content with far-off values; he knows now what he is doing; where he is going; and whether he is getting there (Dessler, 1970, p. 174)."

Eiss (1970, p. 51) reflects the thinking of many educators when he maintains that in the past, many educational objectives have taken two forms: 1) vague generalizations which cannot be disputed but which have very little meaning, "the student will learn to appreciate science" or "the student will gain an understanding of the principles of science," or 2) unstated objectives which teachers would rather deny, "to cover the textbook" or "to pass the College Boards."

Strain (1970, p. 182) reinforces Eiss and states that "Many current efforts toward individualization of instruction necessitate clear state-

ments of behavioral changes expected of learners involved. A subtle implication in many of these movements is that objectives stated in performance or behavioral terms can lift education from its characteristic depths of vagueness and imprecision to heights of clear definition and precise results."

The vague or unstated objectives outlined by Eiss have prompted Dessler (1970, p. 175) to state that the ambiguous objectives have been allowed to exist because, "The misguided humanist fights performance objectives, and the over-worked, harrassed teacher has neither the time nor sees the benefit of stating these objectives." Baker (1970, p. 160) feels that teachers see the new mandates as another short-lived educational craze and only a few will whole-heartedly accept the charge to write objectives. However, Dessler (1970, p. 176) states that "If working on performance objectives serves no other function than to aid the teacher in planning his course with the student in mind and enables the teacher and the administrator to engage in a dialogue concerning the specific skills and attitudes inherent in every classroom, then performance objectives will have proved themselves necessary to our education - and to the student, the ultimate consumer."

Performance Objectives: What are they?

Many authors have attempted to answer the educator's query. McAshan's Writing Behavioral Objectives (1969) attempts to clarify by differentiating between the more familiar general objectives and the relatively new performance objectives. General objectives are teacher-oriented; performance objectives are student-oriented. General objectives, often referred to as goals, are used as a frame of reference to identify the broad aims of educators for the total program. Performance objectives

define specific goals which state in exact terms what behavior, performance, or activity the learner will be doing when he has achieved each goal.

Further expanding McAshan's differentiation of terms, Baker (1970, p. 158) broaches the semantics involved, "Performance objectives, behavioral objectives, operational objectives, and measurable objectives are all synonymous in use for learning outcomes stated in terms of those overt, observable actions of learners which are to change as a consequence of instruction."

At this point the educator might retort that he wants to accomplish more than overt response; he wants the student to think and to understand for himself. Ojemann (1970, p. 275) reminds educators that they cannot see inside of the student to learn whether he has gained understanding or what he is thinking. "The only way the teacher has to determine if internal change has occurred is to observe the student's behavior in specific situations. If the student is aware of the objective, then he can better understand the purpose of instruction and what is expected of him and can thus perform the overt behavior which proves his understanding."

Consensus from these contributors concerning the need for performance objectives would conclude that the only way in which a teacher can determine what the individual has learned, or how he feels, or what he thinks, is to provide a stimulus that will elicit a psychomotor response and then to evaluate this response for evidence that the desired learning has occurred.

Performance Objectives: Must educators write them?

If educators have accepted the need for performance objectives and have understood the definition of performance objectives, they have yet

another question - Do they have to write them? Baker (1970, p. 162) provided empathy, "A substantial obstacle in the path of wholesale adoption of the objective-referenced approach is that the means for implementation has to be locally produced."

Although Instructional Objectives Exchange (IOX), a non-profit organization produces performance objectives for most disciplines and attempts to provide a pool of test items to measure each objective, before educators leap to partake of the sacrament offered by IOX, they should consider Dessler and Cohen.

Dessler (1970, p. 174) views a personal interchange between a teacher and his own students, "Administrators must persuade their faculty that objectives can be formulated to direct learning procedures and that only the teacher, professionally trained to handle the complexity of ideas and the diversity of individual responses, a sensitive and aware human being, can do this kind of evaluation."

Cohen (1970, p. 40) states that "A good teaching-learning process assumes certain fundamental things: 1) Teachers must be able to specify clearly for themselves and for their students the learning objectives and behavioral changes they seek, and must do this before they begin to plan an instructional sequence. 2) Teachers must be prepared to modify their objectives and teaching techniques on the basis of feedback."

Performance Objectives: How are they written?

If educators have accepted the need for performance objectives, have understood the definition of performance objectives, and have become even partially convinced that they themselves must write the performance objectives, they have yet this final question - How are they written? Authors clamoring to answer this question are too numerous to

be recognized in this paper. Perhaps Baker, Mager, Bloom, and Butler are among the most notable.

Baker (1970, p. 161) aptly responds to the query by first explaining what a performance objective is not. Understand concept X is not a performance objective, since understanding is a process internal to the learner and cannot be measured in performance terms; write an example of concept X is a performance objective, since writing is a learner's overt response which can be measured in performance terms.

Mager (1962), realizing that objectives are usually stated poorly because so few people know how to proceed, proposes to show educators how to state objectives that best succeed in communicating their intent to others. From the book Preparing Instructional Objectives, Mager's readers receive maximum programmed information with minimum reading because the reader is directed to locations in the book according to his needs as determined by his response to questions.

As early as 1956 Bloom attempted to build a taxonomy of educational objectives which provide the basis for building curricula and tests. Of particular importance to Florida educators is McAshan (1969), Director of Project Ideals, Gainesville, who has developed a booklet for use in performance objective writing workshops.

Butler (1970, p. 45-46) illustrates the criteria for clearly stated objectives and summarizes with three basic questions that must be answered by the objective-referenced approach: 1) What should the student do in order to show that he has learned the content of the skill? 2) Under what conditions should the student be able to do this? 3) To what extent (degree) will the student be expected to perform?

Performance Objectives: Are they the total answer?

Performance objectives, holding forth some prospect for improved

education and accountability for such, merit attention. However, "All that glitters . . ." and performance objectives have not been completely purged.

In support of this point, Strain (1970, p. 182) raises two unanswered questions: "What provisions are being made for continuity of learning from one level of education to another?" "Are learner's personal inclinations and abilities to inquire into a topic being unduly restricted?"

Baker (1969, p. 6) points out that although proponents cite the obvious value in the teacher's knowing where he and the students are going and how to evaluate when they get there, others are concerned that such objectives hinder the full development of the student and force the teacher to be inflexibly directed toward limited goals.

Eiss' (1970, p. 54-56) summation of negative and positive points of performance objectives equates a swinging pendulum. He discusses three hazards and then takes a positive attitude and suggests a plan for action:

Hazards:

1. Many performance objectives are trivial and deal with specific facts but do not describe behaviors that demonstrate the student's ability to think and reason.
2. Many objectives deal with the lower levels of the cognitive domain, and too few deal with the affective domain.
3. Some spontaneity may be lost and some of the teaching goals may be limited by a catalog of objectives.

Suggestions for Action:

1. Educators need to examine the real goals of education - as contrasted with the stated goals - and the outcomes that we are now achieving.
2. Educators need to place more emphasis and study on the student's willingness to respond. Why teach a student to read if he learns to dislike reading in the process?
3. Educators must move away from the intuitive process to a more formalized process that can be examined objectively.

Eiss reflects the consensus of many researchers and casts his vote for performance objectives. "The inference gap that exists between the desired objective and the development of a valid measure of its attainment will always be a problem. The use of performance objectives does not create this problem - it only makes it more obvious (1970, p. 56)."

Although numerous treatises have been written about performance objectives, research of the literature reveals that educators place varying degrees of importance upon their preparation and use. Policy making which would accelerate or decelerate the use of performance objectives is in potpourri around the nation. It would seem appropriate, at this point, to examine some policy making, or the lack of it, that would speak to performance objectives. The following chapter delineates responses in alphabetical order from every state-level agency that provided input for this paper.

## CHAPTER III

## POLICY EFFECTING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Performance objectives that would measure the product of education are a major thrust toward accountability. According to Robert F. Bundy (1974, p. 176), "Parents, professional educators, boards of education, legislators, and the general public are justifiably questioning the monies spent on education, school efficiency, what schools are actually accomplishing, and who controls the results of schooling." However, Bundy radically states that "Accountability is industrial consciousness applied to nonindustrial problems. It is the misplaced response of frustrated consumers who have little else to focus their anger. And it is rapidly becoming the articulated response of professional elites who fear public recrimination and must at all costs protect their position and power. . . To strip away all its pretensions, accountability is a contrived smokescreen to confuse the public and distract attention from the real issues facing American schools today."

In spite of this blistering scathe against educational accountability, the recurrent pressure for accountability is imminent. Gerald E. Sroufe (1975, p. 403) echoes consensus of many educational providers and consumers when he states that, "The experience of most educators in the sixties was one of shared failure: Institutions seldom responded satisfactorily to pressure for change. The Great Society programs in education attracted the energies of many educators who experienced anew the difficulty of changing things." This pressure for change is often,

in fact usually, fathered by agencies remote from, and in many instances seemingly insensitive to the educational process and academic institutions. This catalyst for change is often the product of the explosion of knowledge and the bewildering acceleration in the process of life itself. In either case, education must brave the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and be accountable to the unmitigated evaluators who seek change.

Speaking to the concept of change, James I. Wattenbarger (1973, p. 10) states that "Students are now demanding that they have an opportunity in decision making." According to Wattenbarger, faculty have always felt that they had control over the educational situation and decision making. However, the so-called power of educators and the sought-for power of students may both become secondary to other factors that are competing and intervening with their control. Further, "The power may not be in the boards or the president or even in the unions." Wattenbarger delineates possible, and more likely probable, power plays that will compete in decision making and assessment of education. The egalitarian philosophy has had tremendous impact during the past decade, and other outside forces are ad infinitum: federal legislation, funding programs and priorities within institutions, new agencies within the state governments, new anonymous decision makers, people in development and planning agencies, state budgeting authorities, accreditation or quality control, national organizations' attempt to control quality or programs through accreditation, National Associations such as American Association of Community Junior Colleges, American Council on Education, American Chemical Society, National Council for the Study of Education, and numerous foundations are cutting into the decision making which affects education policy systems. According to Wattenbarger (1973, p. 12), "The most important decisions relative to the development of community colleges

may end up being made by persons who are not directly involved in institutional operation. More and more often decisions are directly affected by other decisions which may be unrelated to the community college itself."

The ragged encounters with decision makers that are impinging upon community junior college operations in our multidimensional society have caused education policy systems, particularly state-level agencies, to exhibit diversified defense and/or solutions toward reconciliation. A near acquiescent or at least a submissive, cooperative stance is evidenced from many agencies in the nation in their effort to mediate between educators and those consumers who are chanting accountability. The happenings in one major thrust toward accountability - the widespread concept of performance-based education across the nation - might profitably be examined.

Because of the obvious lack of policy - official, regulatory, or defacto - concerning performance-based education, reflected in telephone and letter responses from selected states, the writer elected to poll all fifty states. A letter requesting policy data that would speak to performance objectives - current, immediate trends or future possibilities, predictive or planned - was mailed to state-level agencies in each state. (Appendices A and B)

Each state-level agency that responded within the time limitations of this study to the request for policy information relative to performance objectives - their use, their function, their acceptance or rejection - is delineated in alphabetical order by state. The complete communications are contained in Appendix C.

Some of the following excerpts represent an approximation toward a statement of policy and operating procedures for shaping community junior

college programs. In many cases the state-level agency director, in cooperation with this request for information, makes this approximation toward a statement of policy in the absence of existing policy.

ARIZONA

The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona relayed sincere regrets that they did not have the staff or time to comply with the request.

ARKANSAS

The Department of Higher Education states that there has been no discussion of performance objectives being required from the state level and, further, that there has been no formalized action at any one school to put all courses on that basis. The community college system in Arkansas is a state/local cooperative system which includes control of the institutions by a local board. Therefore, "everybody is in the act in policy: the Legislature, the Department of Higher Education, the local board, the administrators, the faculty, the students, and the local voters." State level involvement with the quality and types of instruction has been in "voicing our need and support for the better forms of instruction. . . These criteria, while in line with the movement toward performance objectives, deal with the total institution. . . rather than instruction as such." However, the state-level position is that "Obviously, effective community college operation requires that one know where one is going in order for one to know if one gets there."

COLORADO

"The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, the state-level policy making group for state system two-

year colleges, has not declared itself as being for or against performance objectives; however, the general feeling is that performance objectives are desirable in the development and operation of two-year college programs." The essential ways that effective community college operations depend upon performance objectives "are how well the objectives are planned and written, how well the objectives are met through instruction, and how well the evaluation of the process is carried to completion." The formulation of policies for the implementation of performance objectives, however, "is not a high level priority for state officials, agencies, or colleges in Colorado."

DELAWARE

The broad based procedural guidelines for curriculum development contain the following statements:

"1. A curriculum committee comprised of Deans of Instruction shall be responsible for planning and development of new courses, using performance based strategy. . .

2. There shall be continuous evaluation through a variety of methods including follow-up studies of all programs. . .

3. Program and course outcomes shall be performance based with behaviorally stated objectives, matched to student needs as well as changing job requirements.

4. Curriculum development shall utilize well defined and specific task and skill analysis with related evaluation criteria.

5. The student evaluation system is based on, and derived from, the performance based curriculum and measures the level of individual performance in terms of 'can' or 'cannot' meet course objectives.

6. Every effort shall be made to allow students to progress at their own pace. When performance objectives are met, the student should be moved on to new challenges.

7. The committee of Deans of Instruction shall develop, implement, and be responsible for preservice programs for all new instructors. . . for orientation.

The preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives are operational throughout our multi-campus state-wide instruction."

FLORIDA

As far as is known, "The only requirement concerning performance objectives from the State is associated with the implementation of the follow-up evaluation system. That system calls for the identification of the performance which should be expected of people who complete the respective programs of the community colleges and for the evaluation of the performance of former students in terms of those expected performance objectives." Guidelines for Placement Services Follow-Up Studies, Dropout Studies in Florida Community Colleges, Department of Education, states that assessment shall be designed to answer, "How well is the attainment of the goals and objectives of instructional programs reflected in the performance of former students?" Further, "for each degree, certificate, diploma, and other instructional program offered by a community college the following steps are to be taken: 1) Identify program goals and objectives. 2) Devise instruments and procedures for assessing. . . 3) Draw conclusions relative to the adequacy of program goals and objectives and make such changes as are appropriate.

IDAHO

The State of Idaho does not have a central board or coordinating council for community junior colleges.

ILLINOIS

The Illinois Community College Board is a coordinating board but as such does not have governing power over the 48 community colleges. Each community college district has its own local boards or trustees. The administrators and the local boards of trustees

are responsible for any policy or administrative procedures having to do with performance objectives.

KANSAS

"State level policy making groups are promoting performance objectives." Performance objectives "provide the base for a continuing follow-up and evaluation." The use of performance objectives "probably doesn't affect basic institution intentions but the positive attitude lends sanction to local activity." However, decisions concerning the use of performance objectives "are a local matter, and the state merely provides leadership and guidelines for action."

KENTUCKY

"There is a demonstrated interest on the part of most people in the University of Kentucky Community College System relative to the concept of performance objectives. The approach is being made through working with faculty groups on improving the effectiveness of their instruction."

LOUISIANA

"There is no state level planning concerning performance or behavioral objectives in community junior colleges in Louisiana and. . . Louisiana has no junior college system."

MAINE

There are only three community colleges in Maine and each institution makes its own decision concerning policy relative to performance objectives.

MASSACHUSETTS

"State level policy making groups are moving towards performance objectives as one part of a general movement toward accountability. The local community colleges support this movement for those pro-

gram areas where performance objectives can be most clearly defined. State level planning is not demanding that the faculty write performance objectives at this time. . . but we think the establishment of performance objectives plays an important part in establishing general accountability concerning the use of public funds." In fact, "Vocational Education funding requires the development of performance objectives in career programs when proposals are made. Other planning activities are also encouraging the movement toward the development of performance objectives."

MISSOURI

"The only activity at the state level regarding performance objectives is taking place within the Division of Career and Adult Education, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This is basically the result of that agency's responsibility for vocational-technical education at both the secondary and postsecondary levels."

NEBRASKA

Performance objectives are of concern only to the technical community colleges.

NEVADA

The Community College Division, University of Nevada System "does not utilize performance objectives."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

In New Hampshire "the two-year post-secondary institutions are of the Vocational-Technical College and Technical Institute types with no transfer programs per se." Although, "There is now no major effort to request that performance objectives be stated for each

course or program. . . However, in as much as each of the programs is designed to prepare for employment, each program and each course have implied performance objectives." Further, "There is state level support for the development and use of performance objectives in the future. In the instructional realm, we feel that the use of performance objectives will assist students in selecting programs, determining when they may best attempt to 'exam out' of a course, improve articulation, focus faculty attention on what their course is intended to achieve, improve grading or instructor evaluation of students, assist in setting priorities for personnel and equipment needs, assist faculty in self-evaluation, and assist Deans and department Chairmen in faculty evaluation." Initially, "The state office is first attempting to provide its own personnel (in large measure achieved) and local institution presidents with assistance including workshops in the MBO method. The theory is, that to work, the process must be understood and practiced by the Chief Executive. It is the present objective of the state office and the president level people to work in the 1975-76 school year with deans' level personnel in staff development, and hopefully, by 1976-1977 Division Chairmen and faculty will be involved in training in performance objectives."

NORTH CAROLINA

"Performance objectives are accepted and used by some faculty members at some institutions in the North Carolina Community College System. . . Current state-level planning efforts do not require the use of performance objectives. . . the Department of Community Junior Colleges is essentially neutral in regard to whether the use of performance objectives is accelerated or decelerated. . . their

use or non-use is up to the local boards, administrators, and faculties of the community colleges in this state." Further, the Community College State Board believes "that it is entirely possible to undo the potential good which might result from the use of performance objectives if they are required to be used across the board in all subjects and/or if the method of writing them is highly detailed and prescriptive."

NORTH DAKOTA

The colleges in North Dakota are not under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Higher Education but are "under the jurisdiction of the school board of the districts in which they are located."

OKLAHOMA

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education "approve functions and programs and courses of study in each institution in The State System, however, it then becomes the responsibility of the individual institutions, their administrators, and Governing Board to administer the programs in such fashion as to achieve the objectives of the program."

"At least one institution in the state, South Oklahoma City Junior College, has from its inception developed performance objectives for every course in the curriculum. In addition, virtually every community junior college in the state has utilized behavioral objectives for one or more courses. Such development is encouraged by the State Regents and is considered by members of the staff to be a desirable objective for curriculum development."

OREGON

"Several community colleges have been involved in preparing programs on a performance objective basis." However, this decision

is left to individual institutions; there is no state mandate for performance objectives.

PENNSYLVANIA

As a guide for the evaluation and improvement of teaching and learning in the schools of the Commonwealth, Pennsylvania's Ten Goals of Quality Education are stated in behavioral definitions. "Conceived as a complement to Pennsylvania's pioneering efforts to assess the quality of its schools, the study was designed to define and clarify the Ten Goals of Quality Education adopted by the State Board of Education in 1965." The Ten Goals include Self-Understanding, Understanding Others, Basic Skills, Interest in School and Learning, Good Citizenship, Good Health Habits, Creativity, Vocational Development, Understanding Human Accomplishment, and Preparing for a Changing World. These Goals are the product of three years of intensive work and resulted in an increased interest in goal definition in education. Objectives stated in these Ten Goals refer to the performance or change in behavior a student is to exhibit upon completion of instruction. "If one is 'to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency' of educational programs, these objectives must be described in terms of not what the schools do, but in what the students do." These ten booklets of specific goals are complemented by two additional booklets entitled Project Description and General Needs Assessment. This product represents a comprehensive effort and a move toward performance objectives although the State of Pennsylvania does not mandate the preparation and use of performance objectives. However, if educators in that state are to satisfy the Goals for Quality Education, performance objectives are by necessity inherent

in the process.

SOUTH CAROLINA

"Briefly, the sixteen Technical Colleges and Technical Centers under the broad governance of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education function as South Carolina's two-year community college system. The State Board is an independent agency created by the General Assembly with broad policy and funding powers. However, each institution is locally governed by an area commission." The Director of Educational Services "was delighted to respond" as follows:

"1. The State Board and the local area commissions are in accord with the current trend to develop and evaluate curricula and courses against behaviorally stated performance objectives.

2. Prior to 1972, State level planning encouraged faculty to write performance objectives but as a result of a sweeping modification of all diploma and degree programs, the establishment of a systemwide catalog of approved courses and articulation with senior institutions, institutional faculty will be required to write performance objectives.

3. . . . the teaching faculty accept the writing of performance objectives as an obligation consistent with the educational purposes of the institutions. Obviously there exists ranges of skills among the teaching faculty but the institutional and statewide in-service activities are designed to assist them to write and implement performance objectives. As can be expected, faculty members teaching in the Humanities and Social Sciences are the most reluctant to take on this task. As a generalization, it is my opinion that they prefer to teach as they were taught.

4. Effective community college operation probably does not depend upon performance objectives written by faculty. There is certainly evidence that the process and evaluation of learning is more effective when the objectives of learning are stated in measurable terms.

5. Our system is accelerating the movement toward performance objectives through the mechanism of our system catalog of approved courses. The ultimate aim of this activity is uniformity in course number, title, credits, catalog description, and syllabus stated in behavioral terms. Local

> pedagogical processes, however, will not be dictated at the state level. It should be noted that state funding for the institutions is based at the course level, and only courses listed in the system inventory generate FTE's. Can you think of any more efficient mechanism to accelerate the movement toward performance objectives? Remember, I said efficient mechanism not better mechanism."

These responses refer only to activities within the South Carolina Technical Education System. No response was forthcoming from the two-year branches of the University of South Carolina.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota has no community junior colleges. "We believe that this is because South Dakota with its very sparce rural population already has a four-year college or university in every community of the state large enough to support a college of any kind. In the sense of the kind of institution your study is concerned with, we have none in South Dakota."

TEXAS

"There is no statewide planning regarding performance objectives for Texas Community Junior Colleges. There is a legislative mandate to encourage research into innovative and experimental programs, but this could not be construed to mean advocacy of any one instructional mode. The forty-seven public junior/community colleges in Texas vary in the degree to which they have implemented the use of competency based programs. . . The extent of utilization for these and other experimental modes of instruction is an institutional decision, and policy determination within each institution resides in each college's board of trustees. . . There is no statewide policy on this issue."

UTAH

Performance objectives are not mandated by the state-level but

are left to institutional perogative.

WASHINGTON

The preparation or use of performance objectives "has not been addressed as a state level policy issue. The State board for community colleges is neither encouraging nor discouraging performance objectives; any such emphasis exists at the discretion of the twenty-seven separate campuses." However, "Evaluative efforts, especially in instructional programs, are based on what the program was supposed to accomplish. A performance statement of some kind provides such a basis."

Summary of Policy Effecting Performance Objectives

Of the fifty state-level agencies for community junior colleges that were polled for this study, twenty-six responded. From the twenty-six that responded, only one, Nevada, definitely stated that performance objectives were not used in the Community College Division of that state. Seventeen states responded that performance objectives are used in varying degrees and because of numerous external pressures for accountability. Only four of these seventeen states, Delaware, Florida, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, suggested that the preparation and use of performance objectives in instructional programs resulted from a stated or implied state-level mandate. Delaware suggested the most definite state mandate and included performance-based procedural guidelines for curriculum development at Delaware Technical and Community College and stated that "The preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives are operational throughout our multi-campus state-wide institution."

Three states, Florida, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, submitted definite evaluation and funding plans. Although these three agencies did

not commit to state-level mandates for performance objectives, the evaluative and funding procedures necessitate that performance objectives are inherent in the educational process and are mandatory if state-level reporting procedures are to be satisfied. Information from these three states provide the most logical basis for comparison in the way that they address themselves to the use of performance objectives as an accountability measure.

Florida relies upon performance objectives in the implementation of the follow-up evaluation system. Although the state-level does not mandate the writing of performance objectives, the evaluation system "calls for the identification of the performance which should be expected of people who complete the respective programs of the community colleges and for the evaluation of performance of former students in terms of those expected performance objectives."

Pennsylvania sets forth Ten Goals of Quality Education that are stated in behavioral definitions. Objectives stated in these Ten Goals refer to the performance or change in behavior a student is to exhibit upon completion of instruction. "If one is to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency of education programs, these objectives must be described in terms of not what the schools do, but in what the students do." If educators in that state are to meet the Ten Goals of Quality Education, performance objectives for instruction and evaluation are inherent in the process.

South Carolina state level accelerates toward the writing of performance objectives without mandating. The systemwide catalog of approved courses necessitates uniformity in course number, title, credits, catalog description, and syllabus stated in behavioral terms. State funding for the institutions in this state is based at the course level,

and only courses listed in the system inventory generate FTE's.

Based upon the diverse findings of this state-wide poll requesting state-level information concerning the preparation and use of performance objectives in community junior college instructional programs, one logical conclusion is that community junior colleges around the nation are experiencing pressure for accountability from constituents both inside and outside the educational arena. Findings further indicate that community junior colleges are moving, though in most cases halteringly and experimentally, to meet the demands for accountability.

A logical follow-up study to this investigation was to determine the effectiveness of performance objectives as measured by their acceptance, use and function in an instructional program. Homebase is the logical source for this kind of investigation, so Pensacola Junior College faculty were asked for their candid attitudes relative to performance objectives. This attitudinal study and the results are reported in the following chapters.

## CHAPTER IV

## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES: THEIR USE, ACCEPTANCE, AND FUNCTION IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AT PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE

According to Thomas L. Good (1975, p. 367), "The popular view that teachers oppose the principle of accountability in education may be more myth than fact. In a study of some 300 teachers in California, Missouri, North Carolina, and Texas, Good found that roughly 80% of the teachers in the four-state sample expressed general support of the concept of accountability." This study by Good suggests that "Subsequent surveys performed in this area should focus on teacher reaction to methodological and operational aspects of accountability. One question in particular which suggests itself is the extent to which teachers feel that accountability will work in their own school systems, given the constraints of present educational systems in their locale. It may be that while most teachers are favorable to some type of accountability in a hypothetical sense, they may not feel that accountability will work in practice."

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the simple correlation study was to determine the attitudes of Pensacola Junior College faculty members toward the preparation, use, and considered value of performance objectives in the instructional program at Pensacola Junior College. Specifically, the purpose of the study was to determine the relationship existing between these attitudes and 1) the six disciplines, 2) the number of degrees held, and 3) the number of years teaching experience.

Procedure of the Study

An Opinion Poll, developed to determine the use, the acceptance, and the function of performance objectives in the instructional program at Pensacola Junior College, was distributed to 230 faculty members. Data were obtained from the 163 members of Pensacola Junior College faculty who responded to the Opinion Poll. (Opinion Poll Instrument is shown in Appendix D).

Statistical Treatment of the Data

In this investigation the Step-Wise Multiple Regression Program set forth by IBM Scientific Subroutine Package[1] was used to determine the MEAN for each of the nineteen items on the Opinion Poll from faculty members' responses from each of the six separate disciplines represented. The MEAN was tabulated for Exact Science, Language and Fine Arts, Social Science, Health Related, Vocational-Technical, and Adult Education to determine favorable and unfavorable attitudes of faculty members toward performance objectives in each of the six disciplines.[2] The last, twentieth, item on the Opinion Poll which asked "Where do you believe that the mandate for performance objectives originates?" was tabulated separately for each of the six disciplines to determine if faculty members were aware of the education policy systems level that had required them to prepare and use performance objectives in their disciplines.

The IBM Subroutine Package was also used to determine the coefficient of linear correlation between the responses given to each of the nineteen Opinion Poll items from the total population of faculty members

---

[1]The major portion of the statistical computations used in this study was performed by the IBM 360 computer at The University of West Florida.

[2]The tabulated raw data of the MEAN for each Opinion Poll item for each of the six disciplines are reported in Appendix E, Tables I-II.

who responded from all six disciplines collectively and 1) the number of degrees that each faculty member indicated and 2) the number of years teaching experience that each faculty member indicated. Correlation coefficients were used to determine the relationship between faculty attitudes toward performance objectives and degrees held[1] and the relationship between faculty attitudes toward performance objectives and number of years teaching experience.[2]

For the purposes of this study, an analysis of the MEAN for each of the items 1-19 on the Opinion Poll from faculty members in each of the six separate disciplines was sufficient to determine the most favorable and most unfavorable attitudes from each discipline. A Table of Critical Values of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Tuckman, 1972, p. 371) was used to test the significance of the correlation coefficient at the .05 level of significance.

---

[1]Correlation coefficients of Degrees Held vs. Faculty Attitudes are reported in Appendix E, Tables III-IV.

[2]Correlation coefficients of Years of Teaching Experience vs. Faculty Attitudes are reported in Appendix E, Tables V-VI.

## CHAPTER V

## RESULTS OF THE STUDY

As a result of the extensive literature review relative to the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in instructional programs, some useful information has been compiled which might be helpful to Pensacola Junior College faculty who are currently involved in preparing or upgrading performance objectives for their courses. This study has provided some answers to logical questions concerning the preparation and use of performance objectives and has cited resources which would further clarify these questions: 1) What are performance objectives? 2) Are performance objectives needed in instructional programs? 3) Must educators write performance objectives? and 4) How are performance objectives written?

As a result of the nationwide letters to state-level planning agencies for Community Junior Colleges which requested information concerning the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in junior college instructional programs in each state, this study has supported empirical evidence that, even though performance objectives are used for instructional purposes in varying degrees around the country, little consistency exists in directives, approaches, and solutions to the concept of performance-based education.

As a result of the Opinion Poll, developed to determine the use, the acceptance, and the function of performance objectives in the instructional program at Pensacola Junior College, the findings are delineated.

The results of responses from faculty members from the six disciplines represented in this study report diversified attitudes toward the use, acceptance, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program at Pensacola Junior College.[1]

For example, faculty members in Exact Science gave a more favorable response to seventeen of the nineteen items than did any of the other five disciplines. Faculty members in Social Science gave the most unfavorable response to twelve of the nineteen items than did any of the other five disciplines. In rank order from favorable to unfavorable attitudes relative to the use, preparation, and function of performance objectives, the disciplines line up as follows: Exact Science, Vocational-Technical, Language and Fine Arts, Adult Education, Health Related, and Social Science.

As compared to the other five disciplines, the Social Science faculty indicated that they were the most unfavorable to performance objectives when they were mandated at Pensacola Junior College in 1970-71; they ranked themselves as having less knowledge concerning performance objectives than did the other five disciplines; and they rated the help provided during the writing of performance objectives less adequate than did the other five disciplines. Social Science was still the most unfavorable of the six disciplines at the conclusion of upgrading their syllabuses each academic year. Performance objectives have not caused Social Science faculty to explore use of materials, methods, or criterion measures; the other five disciplines indicated, in varying degrees, that performance objectives had caused the exploration of materials, methods, and criterion measures.

As the Opinion Poll responses reflected attitudes relative to student and teacher evaluation, Social Science ranked second highest

[1]Appendix E, Tables I-II, pp. 91-94.

among the other five disciplines in foreseeing the increased possibility for student and teacher evaluation through the use of performance objectives. Faculty members in Health Related subjects ranked the lowest among the other five disciplines in foreseeing the increased possibility for student and teacher evaluation through the use of performance objectives. In rank order from favorable to unfavorable attitudes relative to the increased possibility for student and teacher evaluation through the use of performance objectives, the disciplines line up as follows: Exact Science, Social Science, Vocational-Technical, Language and Fine Arts, Adult Education, and Health Related.

Finally, in rank order from favorable to unfavorable attitudes relative to the value of performance objectives being in <u>any</u> way equal to the effort required to produce them, the disciplines line up as follows: Exact Science, Vocational-Technical, Adult Education, Language and Fine Arts, Health Related, and Social Science.

However, in spite of negative attitudes reported, faculty members in each of the six disciplines strongly indicated that they are more favorable toward performance objectives now than they were four years ago in 1970-71 when Pensacola Junior College was first required to offer performance-based education and faculty members were mandated to write syllabuses and performance objectives for each of their courses. The cumulative MEAN from all disciplines combined for each of the Opinion Poll items, where 1.00 was the most negative response and 3.00 was the most positive response, resulted as follows:

<u>MEAN RESPONSES TO OPINION POLL ITEMS</u>

| <u>Opinion Poll Item</u> | <u>Mean</u> |
|---|---|
| 1. Initial reaction to PO mandate in 1970-71 | 1.71 |
| 2. Knowledge of PO's in 1970-71 | 1.70 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Adequacy of help provided to write PO's in 1970-71 | 1.40 |
| 4. Attitude toward PO's in 1974-75 | 2.32 |
| 5. Attitude toward upgrading PO's each year | 2.65 |
| 6. Knowledge of PO's after upgrading syllabuses each year | 2.36 |
| 7. Attitude toward PO's after upgrading syllabuses each year | 2.30 |
| 8. Reference to PO's for teaching purposes | 2.47 |
| 9. Effect of PO's upon exam preparation | 2.52 |
| 10. Effect of PO's upon teaching methods | 2.54 |
| 11. Effect of PO's upon teacher understanding of course objectives | 2.61 |
| 12. Effect of PO's to encourage exploratory use of materials | 2.38 |
| 13. Effect of PO's to cause instruction to focus upon student | 2.15 |
| 14. Effect of PO's for increased possibility of student-evaluation | 2.28 |
| 15. Effect of PO's for increased possibility of teacher-evaluation | 2.31 |
| 16. Effect of PO's to improve quality of skills for students | 2.39 |
| 17. Value of PO's as compared to effort necessary to prepare them | 2.24 |
| 18. Should the writing of PO's be the faculty member's decision | 1.62 |
| 19. Should the writing of PO's be abolished as an educational fad | 2.26 |

Although the attitudes of Pensacola Junior College faculty members reflect diversified use, acceptance, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program, the results of this Opinion Poll reveal that most of the Pensacola Junior College faculty members' responses were between a neutral position and a favorable position rather than being between a neutral position and an unfavorable position.

Regarding the knowledge that faculty members at Pensacola Junior College have concerning the education policy system level that requires junior college faculty to prepare and use performance objectives, 41 percent of the faculty members included in this study indicated that they knew that the mandate originated at the institutional level. The remaining 59 percent

responded that the state level mandated, that the national level mandated, that the individual instructors decided, or that they did not know where the requirement for preparation and use of performance objectives originated. By discipline, the percent of faculty members who knew that the mandate for performance objectives was at the institutional level is as follows: Adult Education 54%, Language and Fine Arts 52%, Vocational-Technical 39%, Exact Science 35%, Health Related 34%, and Social Science 23%.[1]

The relationship between the faculty member's attitudes about performance objectives and the number of degrees the faculty member holds resulted in negative correlations.[2] Faculty members with a large number of degrees tended to give unfavorable (low) responses and faculty members with a fewer number of degrees tended to give favorable (high) responses. Responses to five of the Opinion Poll items resulted in negative correlations that were significant at the .05 level of confidence. The highest negative correlation occurred on Item 16 concerning the value of performance objectives in improving the quality of skills being mastered by the students. Faculty members who have master or doctorate degrees tended to give (low) unfavorable responses to this question and faculty members who have bachelor degrees tended to give (high) favorable responses to this question. The other four Opinion Poll items with significant negative correlation were: Item 6, <u>At the conclusion of upgrading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives?</u> Faculty members who have master or doctorate degrees tended to rate their knowledge low; faculty members who have bachelor degrees tended to rate their knowledge high; Item 7, <u>At the conclusion of upgrading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives?</u> Faculty members who have a master or doctorate degree tended to rate their attitude (low) unfavorable; faculty members who have a bachelor degree tended to rate

[1] Computed from individual responses in each of the six disciplines
[2] Appendix E, Tables III-IV, pp. 95-98.

their attitude (high) favorable; Item 12, Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? Faculty members who have master or doctorate degrees tended to respond that performance objectives had not caused them to explore methods, etc.; faculty members who hold bachelor degrees tended to respond that performance objectives had caused them to explore methods, etc.; Item 17, Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? Faculty members who have a master or doctorate degree tended to respond that the value of performance objectives was not equal to the effort required to prepare them; faculty members who have a bachelor degree tended to respond that performance objectives were equal in value to the time required to prepare them.

Each of the nineteen Opinion Poll items produced negative correlations between faculty attitudes and the number of degrees held. Although only five of the Opinion Poll items produced a negative correlation that was significant at the .05 level of confidence, it would seem appropriate to say that faculty members who have a higher number of degrees tend to give unfavorable (low) responses to the use, preparation, and function of performance objectives and faculty members who have a lower number of degrees tend to give (high) favorable responses to the use, preparation, and function of performance objectives.

The relationship between the faculty member's attitudes about performance objectives and the number of years of teaching experience that the faculty member had resulted in more positive correlations than in negative correlations.[1] Faculty members with more years of teaching experience tended to give favorable (high) responses and faculty members with fewer years of teaching experience tended to give unfavorable (low) responses. Responses to four of the Opinion Poll items resulted in

[1]Appendix E, Tables V-VI, pp. 99-102.

positive correlations that were significant at the .05 level of confidence; only one of the Opinion Poll items resulted in a negative correlation that was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Four of the Opinion Poll items resulted in positive correlations that were significant at the .05 level of confidence; Item 1, When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? Faculty members who have a large number of years teaching experience tended to give (high) favorable responses; faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience tended to give (low) unfavorable responses; Item 2, When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? Faculty members who have a large number of years teaching experience tended to rate their knowledge high; faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience tended to rate their knowledge low; Item 3, How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? Faculty members who have a large number of years teaching experience tended to rate the help provided as being adequate; faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience tended to rate the help provided as being inadequate; Item 7, At the conclusion of upgrading your syllabuses, how would you rate your attitude about performance objectives? Faculty members who have a large number of years teaching experience tended to give (high) favorable responses; faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience tended to give (low) unfavorable responses.

One of the Opinion Poll items resulted in negative correlation that was significant at the .05 level of confidence; Item 15, Do you foresee any increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? Faculty members who have a large number

of years teaching experience tended to give (low) unfavorable responses; faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience tended to give (high) favorable responses.

Although these were the only five Opinion Poll items that produced correlations that were significant at the .05 level of confidence, Item 8, How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? - produced a positive correlation that is noteworthy. Faculty members who have a large number of years teaching experience tended to give responses which indicated that they referred to their objectives in lesson preparation more often that the faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience.

From this comparison of negative and positive correlations between faculty attitudes and the number of years of teaching experience, it would seem appropriate to say that faculty members who have a large number of years teaching experience tended to give (high) favorable responses to the use, preparation, and function of performance objectives and faculty members who have a low number of years teaching experience tended to give (low) unfavorable responses to the use, preparation, and function of performance objectives.

# CHAPTER VI

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to review the literature relative to the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in instructional programs, to determine what was happening around the country at state level relative to the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in Community Junior College instructional programs, and to determine the attitudes of Pensacola Junior College faculty toward the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program at Pensacola Junior College.

As a result of this study, the first worthwhile recommendation might be to suggest that Pensacola Junior College faculty, particularly those who are negative toward performance-based education, read the literature survey to become more knowledgeable in performance-based education techniques.

The second recommendation, based upon the findings of meager or no policy at state level around the country concerning performance objectives in Community Junior College programs and the lack of consistency in directives, approaches, and solutions to the concept of performance-based education, might be to suggest that individual institutions assume the responsibility of addressing themselves to this one measure of accountability, performance objectives, wherever possible. Even though Pensacola Junior College, under the direction of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, has already addressed itself to this

measure of accountability, campus-wide performance objectives, it would be reasonable to state that a greater, more supportive thrust is needed toward the preparation and use of performance objectives to "win over" those faculty members who are opposed. Some ideas for movement in this direction might be synonymous with the recommendations growing out of the results of the Pensacola Junior College Faculty Opinion Poll which are delineated next.

The third category of recommendations, based upon the results of the Opinion Poll, involve administrators, faculty, and students at Pensacola Junior College.

Administrators should endorse teaching by objectives more strongly, should hire new personnel with this as a qualification criterion, and should provide excellent and persistent training for department heads and deans and for new faculty members. New faculty members who have had no or few years of teaching experience are baffled by performance objectives and should be oriented. If department heads and deans do not understand or accept the use of performance objectives, the faculty who teach in their schools or departments are in a frustrating position. As expressed by several faculty members on the Opinion Poll instrument, faculty members who taught by performance objectives in one department were penalized for assigning excessive A's and B's. The faculty members stated that they were "damned if they did, and damned if they didn't teach by performance objectives." The penalty was a low annual evaluation rating by department head.

Since the Dean of Academic Affairs supports performance-based education, other administrators must make clear in college policy their endorsement of instruction by performance objectives. They should include in policy statement a clear recognition of differences in evaluation

philosophy as determined by the use or the non-use of performance objectives. When performance objectives are clearly stated, the student knows exactly what he must perform and exactly how his performance will be evaluated. If every student in a class meets 'A' grade criteria, then every student in the class has earned his 'A.' If performance objectives are not used, the instructor presumably has a bit more latitude (even to the extent of using his intuition) to assign grades that better fit a normal curve. However, to the instructors who are using performance objectives and are consistently assigning A's and B's to all of their students, one appropriate recommendation might well be that those instructors reevaluate the goals of their course.

In addition to the evaluative procedures, however, if administrators do not endorse the use of performance objectives, and some do not at Pensacola Junior College, it is logical to assume that those administrators would not support their faculty in the use of performance objectives in any respect. In support of this statement, Item 3 on the Opinion Poll - How would you rate the help that was provided during the project of writing performance objectives? - received the most unfavorable response of all the nineteen items on the Opinion Poll. Provision for in-service training to provide orientation for writing and using performance objectives is an administrative responsibility. Some departments at Pensacola Junior College received no such orientation. Based upon this finding in Item 3, it would seem appropriate to recommend that some provision be made to instruct faculty members in the preparation and use of performance objectives.

This recommendation for faculty orientation to performance objectives might even result in some much needed faculty interchange. In fact, one other outcome of this study suggests a solution. Specifically, perhaps

the faculty members in Exact Science and Vocational-Technical - the two disciplines who responded most favorably concerning their knowledge and acceptance of performance objectives - could bravely or altruistically present their points-of-view at department meetings of the disciplines who responded most unfavorably, Social Science and Health Related. The recommendation suggested here depends upon faculties who concern themselves with individuality, innovativeness, teamwork, flexibility to adapt to new conditions, and a commitment to interactions with one another.

Speaking to the lack of faculty interactions, McGeorge Bundy (1970, p. 546) has called the academic departments "the most difficult question of faculty organization that I know . . . one that I believe is more deep-rooted and serious than most of the general issues of governance now so much discussed." David Riesman has called academic departments - from a source that the writer cannot recall - a "scholar's country," and draws the analogy of professors "clinging to their departments with all the emotional fever of rampant nationalism." Interdepartmental sharing and communication might, just might, among other good things, lend some credibility to performance objectives in departments where they are not now accepted. Such a recommendation would, hopefully, inspire the imaginations, not the defenses, of Pensacola Junior College educators and that as a result, some sharing relationships could be built that are truly collaborative, not just psuedo-friendly.

Futher results of this Opinion Poll that reflect negative responses concerning the preparation, use, and function of performance objectives in the instructional program suggest some recommendations to faculty members who registered these unfavorable responses. Faculty members who responded negatively and based their negativism upon such statements as

"performance objectives make for robots instead of scholars" should look critically at their performance objectives. Faculty members who responded negatively and based their negativism upon such statements as "leave us alone and let us get on with the job of teaching" should consider what they are teaching. If the faculty member refuses, or cannot put into written words, what he is doing and what he expects his students to do (no matter how aesthetic or intuitive his teaching goals may be), heaven help us all who identify ourselves as educators. Accountability that would measure the product of education requires the student to show what he can do, and this requirement has nothing to do with the instructor's intuitive feelings about the student nor, for that matter, with the student's intuitive feelings. Whether this kind of accountability measure is good or bad has been debated in volumes. However, the requirement for accountability has not diminished. The fable of knowledge and professors has come to an end because too much change, too much knowledge, and too many students are expanding exponentially. Warren Bennis has repeatedly stated that change is the biggest threat that education faces in the 1970's, and most of us are not coping with it adequately. Although teaching by performance objectives would necessitate a change for many educators, one last recommendation for Pensacola Junior College faculty members is that they best give it a try.

Recommendation concerning performance objectives for the students is very simply put. Demand to know what the course requires of you and how you will know when you have satisfied these requirements - this is what performance-based education is all about.

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

By

Polly Godwin Einbecker

As an instructor of the English language, a subject where many worthy outcomes of teaching and learning must by necessity be a blend of the cognitive and affective domains, I subscribe to performance-based education. Performance objectives should be written statements. If this procedure of writing performance statements serves no other purpose than to help both the instructor and his students to work toward the same objectives, that is reason enough to justify the effort.

If the instructor can clearly state his goals, he is better able to select methods and materials for more applicable learning experiences for his students. If the student knows exactly what is expected of him, he is better able to perform and to benefit from the learning experience. I believe this might be called "knowin' where you're goin'."

One of the most out-worn, yet crucial, needs in education is for courses and programs that will provide the experience that meets the needs of the students. Peter Drucker states, "Teaching is the only major occupation of man for which we have not yet developed tools that make an average person capable of competence and performance."

The chant for accountability in education is demanding that this competency of performance be measurable. The product of education can be measured. One possible measurement examined in this study is in

terms of what objectives the instructor and his student are trying to accomplish and how they will both know when the objectives have been accomplished.

As is the case for all change - and performance-based education is, for some, a change - necessity usually dictates priorities. Accountability is the necessity; the student is the priority - either of which is sufficient reason to urge educators to give performance-based education a fair try.

## REFERENCES


1. Baker, Eva L. "The Instructional Objectives Exchange: Assistance in Goal-Referenced Evaluation." Journal of Secondary Education. Vol. 45, n. 4, (April, 1970), pp. 158-162.

2. Bennis, Warren. Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1969, p. 1.

3. Bundy, McGeorge. "Accountability: A New Disneyland Fantasy." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LVI, n. 3, (November, 1974), pp. 176-180.

4. Bundy, McGeorge. "Were Those the Days?" Daedalus, Vol. 99, No. 3, Summer, 1970.

5. Butler, Lucius. "Performance Objectives for Individualized Instruction." Audiovisual Instruction, Vol. 15, n. 5, (May, 1970), pp. 45-46.

6. Cohen, Ed. "If You're Not Sure Where You're Going, You're Liable to End Up Someplace Else." Media & Methods, Vol. 6, n. 7, (March, 1970), pp. 39-42.

7. Dessler, Norman. "Behavioral Objectives . . . Something for Student and Teacher." Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 45, n. 7, (March, 1970), pp. 174-176.

8. Eiss, Albert F. "Performance Objectives." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principles, Vol. 54, n. 342, (January, 1970), pp. 51-57.

9. Good, Thomas L.; Coop, Richard; Dembo, Myron; Denton, John; Limbacher, Philip. "How Teachers View Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LVI, n. 5, (January, 1975), pp. 367-368.

10. Harris, Seymour E. and Levensohn, Alan, Editors. Education and Public Policy. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1965.

11. Mager, Robert T. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

12. Martorana, S. V. Nova Lecture, Pensacola Junior College, January 1975.

13. McAshan, H. H. Writing Behavioral Objectives. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1969.

14. Ojemann, Ralph H. "Should Educational Objectives be Stated in Behavioral Terms?" The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 70, n. 5, (February, 1970), pp. 271-278.

15. Strain, Lucille B. "Behavioral Objectives: A Needed Perspective." Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 45, n. 4, (April, 1970), pp. 182-184.

16. Sroufe, Gerald E. "Nova's Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders: Looking Backward, Looking Forward." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LVI, n. 6, (February, 1975), pp. 402-405.

17. Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

18. Wattenbarger, James I. Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, n. 2, (October, 1973), pp. 10-12.

# APPENDIX A

## LETTER OF REQUEST FOR STATE LEVEL PLANNING INFORMATION CONCERNING THE PREPARATION AND USE OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

ADDRESSED TO:
COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE
STATE LEVEL PLANNING AGENCIES

_____:

May I ask your help in providing me with current and anticipated state level planning information concerning the preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives for teaching and learning in community junior colleges in your state.

As a part of the course requirement in the Nova Ed.D. Program, I am conducting a study which directs itself to what is happening around the nation (in as many states as possible) with performance objectives in education at the state level.

I have collected the usual historical data on performance objectives and I need data that would speak to current, immediate trends and future possibilities (predictive or planned) in the movement toward or away from performance objectives.

General Guideline Questions:

1. Are the state level policy making groups in accord with individual community junior colleges (for or against) performance objectives?
2. Is state level planning requiring that community junior college faculty write and use performance objectives?
3. Are community junior college faculty resisting the mandate?
4. Are there any litigations coming from policy concerning the preparation and use of performance objectives?
5. In what essential ways does effective community college operation depend upon performance objectives?
6. How is the state level accelerating or decelerating the movement toward or away from performance objectives?
7. Which officials, agencies, organizations are involved in policy, planning, or formulation toward performance objectives in single community colleges, in multi-campus community colleges, in state systems community colleges, in regional systems community colleges, and at the Federal Government level?

I would appreciate your sharing any information that might treat any or all of the general questions listed above. The time limitations on this study prompt me to ask for your quick reply to expedite my investigation.

If this finished document, which will report the state level policies concerning performance objectives, could be of any value to your agency, I will provide you with a copy of the abstract.

Sincerely,

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

APPENDIX B

COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE
STATE LEVEL PLANNING AGENCIES
WHO RECEIVED REQUEST LETTER

ALABAMA
State Department of Education

ALASKA
Division of Statewide Services

ARIZONA
Arizona State Board of Directors
for Community Colleges

ARKANSAS
Department of Higher Education

CALIFORNIA
California Community Colleges

COLORADO
State Board for Community Colleges
and Occupational Education

CONNECTICUT
Board of Trustees of Regional
Community Colleges

DELAWARE
Delaware Technical and Community
College

FLORIDA
Department of Education
Division of Community Colleges

GEORGIA
Board of Regents
University System of Georgia

HAWAII
University of Hawaii

IDAHO
Office of Higher Education

ILLINOIS
Illinois Junior College Board

INDIANA
State Superintendent, Office of
Public Instruction

IOWA
State Department of Public
Instruction

KANSAS
Community Junior Colleges and
Teacher Education Section

KENTUCKY
Community College System

LOUISIANA
Teachers Education, Certification,
and Placement, State Department

MAINE
Higher Education Facilities Commission

MISSOURI
Junior College Education
Division of Public Schools

MARYLAND
Maryland State Board for Community
Colleges

MASSACHUSETTS
Massachusetts Board of Regional
Community Colleges

MICHIGAN
Higher Education Planning and
Coordination Services

MINNESOTA
Minnesota State Junior College
System

MISSISSIPPI
Division of Junior Colleges

MONTANA
Office of the Superintendent of the
Public Instruction

NEBRASKA
State Department of Education

NEVADA
State Department of Education

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical
Education

NEW JERSEY
Community College Program

NEW MEXICO
Board of Educational Finance

NEW YORK
State University of New York

NORTH CAROLINA
Department of Community Colleges

NORTH DAKOTA
State Board of Higher Education

OHIO
Board of Regents

OKLAHOMA
State Regents for Higher Education

OREGON
Instructional Services
Oregon Board of Education

PENNSYLVANIA
Office of the Commissioner
Department of Education

RHODE ISLAND
Rhode Island Junior College

SOUTH CAROLINA
South Carolina Commission on
Higher Education

SOUTH DAKOTA
State Department of Public Instruction

TENNESSEE
Tennessee Community Colleges
State Department of Education

TEXAS
Coordinating Board Texas College
and University System

UTAH
Utah System of Higher Education

VERMONT
Division of Teacher and Continuing
Education Services

VIRGINIA
Virginia Community College System

WASHINGTON
State Board for Community College
Education

WEST VIRGINIA
West Virginia Board of Regents

WISCONSIN
University Center System

WYOMING
Community College Commission

# APPENDIX C

## THE STATUS OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES USED FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES AS REPORTED BY EACH STATE-LEVEL AGENCY FOR COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGES

RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM
STATE LEVEL PLANNING AGENCIES


| STATE | Page |
|---|---|
| ALABAMA | * |
| ALASKA | * |
| ARIZONA | 55 |
| ARKANSAS | 56 |
| CALIFORNIA | * |
| COLORADO | 58 |
| CONNECTICUT | * |
| DELAWARE | 60 |
| FLORIDA | 62 |
| GEORGIA | * |
| HAWAII | * |
| IDAHO | 63 |
| ILLINOIS | 64 |
| INDIANA | * |
| IOWA | * |
| KANSAS | 65 |
| KENTUCKY | 66 |
| LOUISIANA | 67 |
| MAINE | 68 |
| MARYLAND | * |
| MASSACHUSETTS | 69 |
| MICHIGAN | * |
| MINNESOTA | * |
| MISSISSIPPI | * |
| MISSOURI | 70 |
| MONTANA | * |
| NEBRASKA | 71 |
| NEVADA | 72 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | 73 |
| NEW JERSEY | * |
| NEW MEXICO | * |
| NEW YORK | * |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 75 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | 77 |
| OHIO | * |
| OKLAHOMA | 78 |
| OREGON | 79 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | * |
| RHODE ISLAND | * |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 80 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | 83 |
| TENNESSEE | * |
| TEXAS | 84 |
| UTAH | 85 |
| VERMONT | * |
| VIRGINIA | * |
| WASHINGTON | 86 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | * |
| WISCONSIN | * |
| WYOMING | * |




*These states did not respond to inquiry

# State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona

1535 WEST JEFFERSON, ROOM 123
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
(602) 271-4037

CHAIRMAN
MRS. JANE DREES
411 SULLIVAN
MIAMI, ARIZONA 85539
GILA COUNTY

VICE CHAIRMAN
LESLEY BLANCHARD
P. O. BOX 3328
WEST SEDONA, ARIZONA 86340
YAVAPAI COUNTY

SECRETARY
LLOYD L. HANES
BOX 97703
LAKE HAVASU CITY, ARIZONA 86403
MOHAVE COUNTY

TREASURER
ARNOLD P. JEFFERS
9778 E. TANQUE VERDE RD.
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85715
PIMA COUNTY

MEMBERS
JOE ATMAR
YUMA COUNTY

MRS. MARGARET CHRISTY
EX-OFFICIO
BOARD OF REGENTS

BENJAMIN J. COHEN
PINAL COUNTY

H. ALAN DAY
GREENLEE COUNTY

EUGENE L. DORR
EX-OFFICIO
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

C. THEODORE KRAFT
COCHISE COUNTY

MRS. ALICE LARRIVA
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

MRS. MERLE B. PLATT
APACHE COUNTY

DON PRESTON
GRAHAM COUNTY

JOSEPH P. RALSTON
MARICOPA COUNTY

W. P. SHOFSTALL
EX-OFFICIO
STATE SUPT. PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

DREW SHUMWAY
NAVAJO COUNTY

GEORGE H. YARD
COCONINO COUNTY

GEORGE L. HALL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

January 29, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Professor Einbecker:

We very much regret that we do not have the staff time to respond to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

George L. Hall

George L. Hall
Executive Director

GLH/les

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
401 NATIONAL OLD LINE BUILDING
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72201

David Pryor
GOVERNOR

M. OLIN COOK
DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE:
371-1441
371-1442
371-1443

February 3, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Please accept my answering of your questions and referring to them in numerical order as you presented them.

1. Generally, the state level policy making groups and individual community college groups agree with the purposes of performance objectives. However, there has been no great discussion of them being required from the state level, and there has been no formalized action at any one school to put all courses on that basis.

2. No, not formally

3. Not applicable

4. Not applicable

5. Obviously, effective community college operation requires that one know where one is going in order for one to know if one gets there.

6. In our developmental situation the only state level involvement with the quality and types of instruction has been voicing our need and support for the better forms of instruction. We have developed the requirement that an institution be adequately comprehensive, and we have specified the functions which were visualized for a community college. We make an annual determination of comprehensiveness based on our adopted criteria for comprehensiveness. These criteria, while in line with the movement toward performance objectives, deal with the total institution at the program level rather than instruction as such.

B. J. LAMBERT, JR.
VICE-CHAIRMAN
CROSSETT

HENRY GSCHWEND
JONESBORO

C. H. MURPHY, JR.
EL DORADO

HOWARD HOLTHOFF
CHAIRMAN
GOULD

MARLIN JACKSON
PARAGOULD

HARRY PONDER, SR.
WALNUT RIDGE

MRS. CORLISS M. HOWARD
SECRETARY
CONWAY

FRED MacDONALD
BRINKLEY

HENRY SHREVE
FAYETTEVILLE

JIM SNODDY
VAN BUREN

7. Our community college system is a state/local cooperative system which includes state funding for operation, local funding for facilities, control of the institutions by a local board, and state level coordination. Therefore, everybody is in the act in policy: the Legislature, the Department of Higher Education, the local board, the administrators, the faculty, the students, and the local voters.

Sincerely,

Tom Spencer
Assistant Director for
Community Colleges

TMS:vc

JOHN D. VANDERHOOF, Governor

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

207 STATE SERVICES BUILDING • 1525 SHERMAN STREET • DENVER, COLORADO 80203

M. G. LINSON, DIRECTOR
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
&
BOARD EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
(303) 892-3011

F. DEAN LILLIE, DIRECTOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(303) 892-3181

January 28, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
600 Parker Drive
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

In response to your letter of January 20, 1975 to Dr. F. Dean Lillie, State Director of Colorado Community Colleges, Colorado is moving in the following direction in the implementation of performance or behavioral objectives in the two-year colleges.

Response to: General Guideline Questions

1. The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education which is the state level policy making group for state system two-year colleges has not declared itself as to being for or against performance objectives, however; it is a general feeling that performance objectives are desirable in the development and operation of two-year college programs.

2. The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education is not demanding the two-year college faculties write performance objectives.

3. There is no edict for the faculty to reject.

4. There are no litigations coming from these objectives.

5. The essential ways that effective community colleges operate depending upon performance objectives, in my opinion, are how well the objectives are planned and written, how well the objectives are met through instruction and how well the evaluation of the process is carried to completion.

6. The state is not moving in either an accelerating or decelerating direction. in the implementation of performance objectives in the two-year colleges.

7. Generally the formulation of policies for the implementation of performance objectives is not a high level priority for state officials, agencies, or colleges in Colorado.

I hope this information will prove of assistance to you in your study. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jon E. Glau

Jon E. Glau
Assistant Director
Curriculum & Instruction

gc

DELAWARE TECHNICAL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

P. O. BOX 897

DOVER, DELAWARE 19901

302 / 678-4021

Office of the President

January 28, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker
Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Ms. Einbecker:

Your recent request to Mr. Paul K. Weatherly, President of Delaware Technical and Community College, was referred to this office.

It is the mission of Delaware Technical and Community College to foster the student centered considerations as a major activity. The challenge and promise of the college lie in its ability to offer a viable alternative to the more conventional versions of Higher Education. Consequently, the education at Delaware Technical and Community College is striving to be a multi-media competency based, systems approach to education.

Our broad based procedural guidelines for curriculum development contain the following statements:

1. A curriculum committee comprised of the Deans of Instruction shall be responsible for the planning and development of new courses, using performance based strategy. This committee shall appoint such standing subcommittees or specific program development committees as they deem necessary.

2. There shall be continuous evaluation through a variety of methods including follow-up studies of all programs to determine whether the skills and levels of proficiency acquired by the graduate are appropriate to the job for which the student was trained.

3. Program and course outcomes shall be performance based with behaviorally stated objectives, matched to students' needs as well as changing job requirements.

4. Curriculum development shall utilize well defined and specific task and skill analysis with related evaluation criteria.

5. The student evaluation system is based on, and derived from the performance based curriculum, and measures the level of individual performance in terms of "can" or "cannot" meet course objectives.

6. The overall objectives of a program shall be defined by the capabilities (skills, knowledge, attitudes) the student is to have when he completes the program.

7. Every effort shall be made to allow students to progress at their own pace. When performance objectives are met, the student should be moved on to new challenges.

8. The committee of Deans of Instruction shall develop, implement and be responsible for a preservice program for all new instructors - part-time and full-time. It is suggested that a self-instruct, individualized, multi-media course be developed. A course that can be supplemented by group seminars and specific orientation with department heads.

The preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives are operational throughout our multi-campus state-wide institution.

Sincerely,

Ray G. Schweet

Ray G. Schweet
Curriculum Coordinator

RGS/paj

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TALLAHASSEE 32304

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

Lee G. Henderson
Director
Division of Community Colleges

February 10, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker
Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Dr. Henderson has asked me to respond to your letter of January 20 relative to the use of performance objectives in community colleges in Florida.

To the best of my knowledge the only requirement from the State is associated with the implementation of the follow-up evaluation system. That system calls for the identification of the performance which should be expected of people who complete the respective programs of the community colleges and for the evaluation of the performance of former students in terms of those expected performance objectives. A copy of the guidelines for the evaluation system is enclosed for your information.

Recognizing that this reply may not satisfy all your questions, I would be pleased to discuss the matter with you by telephone or respond in writing if you prefer.

With very best wishes for your work in the Nova program, I am

Sincerely yours,

Myron R. Blee
Chief
Bureau of Program Support and Services

MRB:kjc

Enclosure

STATE OF IDAHO

# STATE BOARD of EDUCATION

63

Office of the Executive Director

614 W. State Annex #2
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 384-2270

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. P. Einbecker:

The State of Idaho does not have a central board or coordinating council for community junior colleges. Therefore, we do not collect the information you are asking for in your survey or questionnaire.

You might want to contact the two-year institutions directly. Their addresses are as follows:

Mr. Barry G. Schuler, President
North Idaho College
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814

Dr. James L. Taylor, President
College of Southern Idaho
Twin Falls, Idaho 83301

Dr. Henry B. Eyring, President
Ricks College
Rexburg, Idaho 83440

The first two colleges are public junior colleges with local boards. The last college is a private two-year college controlled by the LDS church.

We are sorry we cannot be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

B. Douglas Aims

B. Douglas Aims

MEMBERS
Rey W. Brune, Chairman
Merlin Karlock, Vice-Chairman
John Copley
Frank F. Fowle
Toussaint L. Hale, Jr.
Mrs. Carl H. Neyhart
James W. Sanders
Mrs. Andrew Scott
Richard P. Stone
Michael J. Bakalis

LEGAL COUNSEL
Donald Zeglis

STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD
544 ILES PARK PLACE
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62718
PHONE (217) 782-2495

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Fred L. Wellman

DEPUTY SECRETARY FOR FINANCE
Howard D. Sims

ASSOCIATE SECRETARIES
Lawrence J. Auten
G. Robert Barnes
John L. Forbes
Richard L. Fox
James M. Howard
William G. Matlack
John J. Swalec, Jr.

ADMINISTRATION & PUBLIC
INFORMATION OFFICE

3 February 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker
Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
600 Parker Drive
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Your request for information regarding the behavioral or performance objectives for the State of Illinois has come to me for reply. The Illinois Community College Board is a coordinating board and as such does not have governing power over the 48 community colleges. The 48 community colleges are organized into 38 community college districts, each with their own local boards of trustees and their own locally hired administrators. The administrators and the local boards of trustees are responsible for any policy or administrative procedures having to do with performance objectives.

I am enclosing a copy of our brochure on community colleges which lists the names and addresses of the community colleges on the last page. Please feel free to write any of these colleges for information pertaining to performance objectives.

Very truly yours,

Richard L. Fox

Richard L. Fox
Associate Secretary

RLF/db

Enclosure

# Kansas State Department of Education

*Kansas State Education Building*

120 East 10th Street Topeka, Kansas 66612

**Division of Continuing Education**


January 23, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

The following is in response to your letter of January 20, 1975:

1. State level policy making groups are promoting performance objectives.

2. No.

3. NA

4. None yet

5. It provides a base for continuing follow-up and evaluation.

6. Probably doesn't affect basic institution intentions but the positive attitude lends sanction to local activity.

7. The State Board of Education is a coordinating agency. Decisions of this nature are a local matter. The state merely provides leadership and guidelines for action.

If we can be of further to you, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

Joe Miller

Joe Miller, Director
Community College Section

JM:pm

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40506

STANLEY WALL, VICE PRESIDENT

January 29, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

This is an attempt to respond to the questions in your letter of January 20.

(1) There is a demonstrated interest on the part of most people in the University of Kentucky Community College System relative to the concept of performance objectives. The approach is being made through working with faculty groups on improving the effectiveness of their instruction.

(2) There is no one at any level demanding that faculty write performance objectives. Unless the faculty understands the concepts and learn to use them little is achieved by their going through the formality of writing objectives.

(3 and 4) No.

(5) Each of the colleges have been working on short range and long range plans for their college. This is being done by the faculty and administration of the college in an effort to identify the significant educational role of the college. Some colleges have involved as many as 150 to 200 lay people from their service area in assisting with this planning.

I am not fully clear as to how you are defining performance objectives. From your first question I thought you were referring to them in the context of the instructional program, however, in question six and seven it seems that you are concerned with objectives of a college or unit rather than the specific objectives identified with a course or instructional program.

Sincerely,

Stanley Wall

Stanley Wall, Vice President
for Community Colleges



ASHLAND, 1957; HENDERSON AND SOUTHEAST, 1960; ELIZABETHTOWN AND PRESTONSBURG, 1964; HOPKINSVILLE, LEXINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE, AND SOMERSET, 1965; JEFFERSON, 1967; HAZARD, MADISONVILLE, MAYSVILLE, AND PADUCAH, 1968
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM ESTABLISHED 1964

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY UNIVERSITY

STATE OF LOUISIANA
LOUISIANA COORDINATING COUNCIL
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
P. O. Box 44362, Capitol Station
BATON ROUGE 70804
AREA CODE 504 – 389-6771

January 29, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Your letter to Dr. James DeLee of the State Department of Education has been referred to this office for reply. There is no state level planning concerning performance or behavioral objectives in community junior colleges in Louisiana. As you may know, Louisiana has no junior college system. In addition to three 2-year branches of universities, there is one comprehensive community college, Delgado Junior College. Dr. Cecil Groves, the Academic Vice President of that institution, may be able to answer your questions with respect to his college. His address is listed below in case you wish to contact him.

Dr. Cecil Groves
Delgado Junior College
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

Good luck with your study.

Sincerely,

Anne T. Lastilla

Anne T. Lastilla
Research Associate

ATL:bdw

STATE OF MAINE

Department of
Educational and Cultural Services

AUGUSTA, MAINE 04330

January 28, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

In response to your letter of January 20, at present there are only 3 community colleges in Maine, as follows:

University of Maine at Augusta
Augusta, Maine 04330

Bangor Community College
Bangor, Maine 04401

York County Community College
195 Main Street
Sanford, Maine 04073

I have enclosed a list of postsecondary education institutions in Maine, and I would suggest you contact them directly for further information.

Sincerely,

Wayne H. Ross
Director
Higher Education Services

WHR:jf

Enc.

Four seasons for Me.

*The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

*Board of Regional Community Colleges*

CUSTOM HOUSE PLAZA
177 MILK STREET, BOSTON, MASS. 02109
Telephone: 727-2876

January 30, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

I will answer the questions you asked on Behavorial Objectives as best I can, as in your own case. Time limitations restrict the amount of information gathering we can develop in answer to your questions:

1. State Level Policy making groups are moving towards performance objectives as one parto of a general movement toward accountability. The local community colleges support this movement for those program areas were performance objectives can be most clearly defined.

2. State level Planning is not demanding that the faculty write Performance Objectives at this time.

3. No

4. No

5. As indicated in our answer in number one, we think the establishment of performance objectives plays an important part in establishing general accountability concerning the use of Public Funds.

6. Vocational Education Funding requires the development of Performance Objectives in career programs when proposals are made. Other planning activities are also encouraging the movement toward the development of performance objectivies.

7. The Division of Occupational Education and this office.

Sincerely,

Gordon B Pyle

Gordon B. Pyle
Director of Educational Planning

THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

600 CLARK AVENUE
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65101
(314) 751-2361

January 24, 1975

JACK L. CROSS
COMMISSIONER
OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

The only activity at the state level regarding performance objectives is taking place within the Division of Career and Adult Education, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This is basically as a result of that agency's responsibility for vocational-technical education at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. I suggest you contact Dr. Frank Drake, Coordinator, Career Education, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, P. O. Box 480, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101, and request a copy of the State Plan which should spell out their approach.

Sincerely,

Dale C. Schatz

Dale C. Schatz, Director
Academic Programs

DCS/cf

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

GERALD T. WHELAN, PRESIDENT
P. O. BOX 305
HASTINGS 68901

MRS. MARILYN FOWLER, VICE PRESIDENT
1904 PLUM CREEK LANE
LEXINGTON 68850

FRANK E. LANDIS
524 LINCOLN BUILDING
LINCOLN 68508

R. JERRY HARGITT
100 SOUTH 19TH STREET
OMAHA 68102

# State of Nebraska

## Department of Education

CECIL E. STANLEY
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

233 SOUTH 10TH STREET LINCOLN 68508

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

WALTER L. MOLLER
112 WEST 3RD STREET
WAYNE 68787

WILLARD H. WALDO
DEWITT 68341

MRS. SHIRLEY A. PETERSON
AMELIA 68711

F. Y. KNAPPLE
3608 PIERCE STREET
OMAHA 68105

January 24, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

I am referring your recent request for information concerning performance objectives to the state office of our technical community colleges:

Dr. Robert Schleiger, Director
State Board of Technical Community Colleges
Century Court Plaza
620 N. 48th
Lincoln, Ne 68504

Sincerely yours,

Gerald Sughroue

GERALD SUGHROUE, Administrator
Management, Planning and
Evaluation Services

CW
cc Dr. Schleiger

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION

Office of the President

January 30, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker
Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Thank you for your interest in the Community College Division, University of Nevada System.

Our Division does not utilize performance objectives.

Please let me know if I can be of any additional assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Leon H. Van Doren
Administrative Assistant
to the President

rw

405 Marsh Avenue Reno, Nevada 89502 (702) 784-4021

Newell J. Paire
Commissioner

Robert L. Brunelle
Deputy Commissioner

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Division of
Post-Secondary Education

163 Loudon Road
Concord, N.H. 03301

February 5, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Your letter to Charles Green has been referred to me for a response. You are aware, I expect, that in New Hampshire the two-year post-secondary institutions are of the Vocational-Technical College and Technical Institute types with no transfer programs per se.

The following responses are my perceptions of the situations here relative to the items listed in your questions:

1. & 2. There is now no major effort to request that performance objectives be stated for each course or program. However, in as much as, each of the programs is designed to prepare for employment, each program and each course have implied performance objectives. There is state level support for the development and use of performance objectives in the future. There is now a definite effort including staff development plans to implement a Management by Objectives program at the President's level. The ultimate goal is to have this M.B.O. System apply next to Dean's level personnel and ultimately to the faculty and other staff level. Further, there is state and local institution support for improving articulation with secondary vocational schools to reduce to a minimum overlap in common program areas.

At this point in time, the most obvious mechanism for achieving subject matter articulation is to have both the secondary and the post-secondary faculties include behavioral objectives in their program and course descriptions. A proposal to develop a model in at least one program area that is common to secondary and post-secondary institutions in a given geographical area has been written but not funded.

3. Faculty reactions are as such unknown since implementation of the M.B.O. (for faculty to include performance objectives in programs and courses) is not yet at their level. However, there are evidences that some will support with enthusiasm since they are already involved in the use of performance objectives in their courses. On the other hand, some other faculty members who, say, have been heard to comment concerning the use of performance objectives in their classes have clearly indicated disapproval.

4. At this point, we would expect no litigations and know of none in process.

5. The following assumes that your question #5 is asking for the opinion of the responder. In that context, I would say that we have felt a management by objectives including the preparation of administrative objectives in a measurable way are and will continue to be needed to assist in the decision-making process.

Included in our estimation will be the plans to provide for setting priorities, evaluating results, assigning responsibilities to achieve most effective operation whether this be in job assignments, dollars allotment, space allotment or similar matters.

In the instructional realm, we feel that the use of performance objectives will assist students in selecting programs, determining when they may best attempt to " exam out " of a course, improve articulation, focus faculty attention on what their course is intended to achieve, improve grading or instructor evaluation of students, assist in setting priorities for personnel and eqyipment needs, assist faculty in self-evaluation, and assist Deans and department Chairmen in faculty evaluation. The goal consistently being to improve instruction.

6. As noted in response to #1 and #2 above, the state office is first attempting to provide its own personnel ( in large measure achieved ) and local institution presidents with assistance including workshops in the M.B.O. method. The theory is, that to work, the process must be understood and practiced by the Chief Executive. It is the present objective of the state office and the president level people to work in the 1975-76 school year with deans' level personnel in staff development and, hopefully, by 1976-77 Division Chairmen and faculty will be involved in training in performance objectives.

Simultaneously, throughout this period, each local institution is being encouraged and provided with some support and leadership to develop a long-range institutional and individual staff development program. It is our intention and hope that this preliminary effort with faculty and administration will set the stage for the implementation component to implement performance objectives.

7. In response to this item, please recall that we are primarily a State System under the State Board of Education and a Commissioner. The initial formal effort started at the Commissioner level but through committee operations involved other state personnel including some from the two-year institutions themselves. The impetus, by and large, is being provided by this state office with policies and practices being developed in consultation with local campus presidents.

Please feel free to write or call should you feel we could provide additional information. I expect that your finished document could be of substantial assistance to us, and we would appreciate a copy of the abstract.

Sincerely,

George M. Strout, Deputy Chief
Post-Secondary Education Division

GMS:shc

cc: Charles Green

DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY COLLEGES
NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
RALEIGH 27611

January 30, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker
Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Dr. Fountain has asked me to reply to your letter dated January 20, 1975. My answers to your guideline questions are matters of opinion rather than matters of hard fact. The answers are as follows:

1. The limited data I have seen and the discussions in which I have been involved suggest that instructional performance objectives are accepted and used by some faculty members at some institutions in the North Carolina Community College System. Conservatively, there is the least limited objection to their use.

2. Current state-level planning efforts do not require the use of such performance objectives.

3. The answer to question 2 makes this question inapplicable.

4. I am unaware of any litigation either for or against the use of faculty performance objectives in this state.

5. In my own opinion, a case can be made on behalf of the use of performance objectives, provided that their use does not become doctrinary and highly prescribed to the point that they become ends rather than means. (In other words, I believe it is entirely possible to undo the potential good which might result from the use of performance objectives if they are required to be used across the board in all subjects and/or if the method of writing them is highly detailed and prescriptive.)

6. I would say that the Department of Community Colleges is essentially neutral in regard to whether the use of performance objectives is accelerated or decelerated.

7. Although the State Department of Administration is engaged at an embryonic level in program budgeting, it could conceivably impenge on the use of instructional performance; in all other ways, I believe their use or non-use is up to the local boards, administrations and faculties of the technical institutes and community colleges in this state.

It is my observation that faculty members in a number of our institutions have for several years been developing and using performance objectives and that they will continue to be used as considered applicable by the practitioners.

I hope this information will be useful to you.

Sincerely,

Terrence A. Tollefson (es)

Terrence A. Tollefson
Associate Vice President
Planning and Coordination

TAT:eh

CC: Dr. Ben E. Fountain, Jr.

NORTH DAKOTA
State Board of Higher Education
STATE CAPITOL
BISMARCK

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

223-8000 EXT. 321

January 28, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

This is in reply to your inquiry of January 20 relative to planning information relating to community junior colleges in North Dakota. Since those colleges in this state are not under the jurisdiction of this Board but are under the jurisdiction of the school boards of the districts in which they are located, I suggest you contact the following administrators of each:

President Ralph Werner
Bismarck Junior College
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

President Merril Berg
Lake Region Junior College
Devils Lake, North Dakota 58301

Dean Garvin Stevens
UND-Williston Center
Williston, North Dakota 58801

Sincerely yours,

Lloyd H. Nygaard

Lloyd H. Nygaard
Assistant Commissioner and
Executive Secretary

LHN:aj



"Buy North Dakota Products"

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

500 Education Building
State Capitol Complex
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
73105

February 4, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

The functions of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education do not include the development of guidelines for curriculum development. The State Regents approve functions and programs and courses of study at each institution in The State System, however, it then becomes the responsibility of the individual institutions, their administrators and Governing Board to administer the programs in such fashion as to achieve the objectives of the program.

In reply, however, to your inquiry regarding the use of performance or behavioral objectives in community junior colleges in Oklahoma, at least one institution in the State, South Oklahoma City Junior College, has from its inception developed performance objectives for every course in the curriculum. In addition, virtually every community junior college in the State has utilized behavioral objectives for one or more courses. Such development is encouraged by the State Regents and is considered by members of the staff to be a desirable objective for curriculum development.

To my knowledge the movement toward the use of behavioral objectives has not been resisted by any significant percentage of the faculty in the various colleges, however, there are always those who are resistant to change. There certainly has been no litigation arising from this question and we do not anticipate such.

I hope that this general response to your inquiry will be of assistance to you. If we may assist you further, please let me know.

Sincerely,

John E. Greek
Executive Assistant
to the Chancellor

JEC/db

OREGON STATE DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION
942 LANCASTER DRIVE NE
SALEM, OREGON 97310

VERNE A. DUNCAN
Superintendent Public Instruction

• Information (503) 378-3569

January 31, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Your letter of January 20 arrived in my office today.

Several community colleges have been involved in preparing programs on a performance objective basis.

I would suggest writing to Dr. Amo De Bernardis, President Portland Community College, 12000 SW. 49th Avenue, Portland OR 97219 for further information.

Cordially,

Carrol deBroekert

Carrol deBroekert
Associate Superintendent
Community Colleges

CdB:js



DON EGGE, Deputy Superintendent | MILT BAUM, Administrative Support | CARROL deBROEKERT, Community College Support | MARY HALL, Program Management Support | LEONARD KUNZMAN, Instructional Support | MASON McQUISTON, Special Education Support

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
RUTLEDGE BUILDING
1429 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

HOWARD R. BOOZER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE
803/758-2407

January 28, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Dr. Howard R. Boozer, our Executive Director, has asked me to respond to your letter of January 20, 1975 requesting information about state level planning concerning the preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives in community junior colleges in South Carolina.

At the present time, South Carolina has a dual two-year public higher educational system. There are 9 regional campuses sponsored by the University of South Carolina. These regional campuses offer college parallel programs and a few occupational programs. There are also 16 institutions (technical colleges and technical education centers) which are administered by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education. Some of the technical colleges offer both college parallel and occupational programs, while others are limited solely to occupational and vocational education.

I am forwarding copies of your letter and my response to Mr. Kenneth Kyre, Director of Educational Services Division, State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, Robinson Building, Lexington Avenue, West Columbia, South Carolina 29169 and Dr. John J. Duffy, Associate Vice Provost for Regional Campuses, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29201. I hope that they may be able to provide information concerning state level policies in relation to performance or behavioral objectives in institutions under their jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

Alan S. Krech
Coordinator of Research

ASK:jm

**STATE BOARD FOR TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION**

Robinson Building, Lexington Avenue, West Columbia, South Carolina 29169

CHARLES E. PALMER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

THE STATE BOARD

*OFFICERS*

Y.W. SCARBOROUGH, JR.
CHAIRMAN

TRACY J. GAINES
VICE CHAIRMAN

CHARLES E. PALMER
SECRETARY

*MEMBERS*

Y.W. SCARBOROUGH, JR.
Charleston, S.C.
First Congressional District

WILLIAM A. HORGER
Orangeburg, S.C.
Second Congressional District

P. HENDERSON BARNETTE
Greenwood, S.C.
Third Congressional District

TRACY J. GAINES
Inman, S.C.
Fourth Congressional District

FRANCIS L. BELL
Fort Mill, S.C.
Fifth Congressional District

JOHN G. WELLMAN
Johnsonville, S.C.
Sixth Congressional District

JOHN L. BAUER
Greenville, S.C.
At Large

HERBERT A. DeCOSTA
Charleston, S.C.
At Large

CYRIL B. BUSBEE
Columbia, S.C.
Superintendent of Education
Ex-Officio

W. MILTON FOLDS
Columbia, S.C.
State Development Board
Ex-Officio

February 10, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Assistant Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Copies of your letter to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and Mr. Krech's response were referred to me. I'm not certain how much you know about the Technical Education system in South Carolina. Briefly, the sixteen Technical Colleges and Technical Centers under the broad governance of the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education function as South Caronina's two-year community college system. The State Board is an independent agency created by the General Assembly with broad policy and funding powers. However, each institution is locally governed by an area commission.

The Executive Director for the State Board has a Central Office staff of over 100 persons with offices located in Columbia. I am Director of Educational Services, one of six divisions of the Central Office organization. On behalf of the Executive Director, I am delighted to respond to your inquiries.

1. The State Board and the local area commissions are in accord with the current trend to develop and evaluate curricula and courses against behaviorally stated performance objectives.

2. Prior to 1972, State level planning encouraged faculty to write performance objectives but as a result of a sweeping modification of all diploma and degree programs, the establishment of a systemwide catalog of approved courses and articulation with senior institutions, institutional faculty will be required to write performance objectives.

3. Based on the contact of my staff with institutional personnell there appears to be no general uprising of the faculty against this activity. In fact, the educational administrators at the institutional level have created an atmosphere in which

teaching faculty accept the writing of performance objectives as an obligation consistent with the educational purposes of the institutions. Obviously there exists ranges of skills among the teaching faculty but the institutional and statewide in-service activities are designed to assist them to write and implement performance objectives. As can be expected, Faculty members teaching in the Humanities and Social Sciences are the most reluctant to take on this task. As a generalization, it is my opinion that they prefer to teach as they were taught.

4. I assume you meant "are there any litigations coming from these objections". The answer is, not to my knowledge.

5. Effective community college operation probably does not depend upon performance objectives written by faculty. There is certainly evidence that the process and evaluation of learning is more effective when the objectives of learning are stated in measurable terms. This should be old hat to you if you have read much of the literature on Teaching by Objectives. If you are asking whether or not performance objectives for all personnel functions in a community college results in effective operation, the answer has to be yes,insofar as the trend toward management by objectives is valid.

6. Our system is accelerating the movement toward performance objectives through the mechanism of our system catalog of approved courses. The ultimate aim of this activity is uniformity in course number, title, credits, catalog description and syllabus stated in behavioral terms. Local pedagogical processes, however, will not be dictated at the state level. It should also be noted that state funding for the institutions is based at the course level, and only courses listed in the system inventory generate FTE's. Can you think of any more efficient mechanism to accelerate the movement toward performance objectives? Remember, I said efficient mechanism not better mechanism.

7. Within our system, the State Board, the local area commissions, Executive Director's staff and institutional personnel are all involved in the development of policy, planning, and formulation of activities related to performance objectives.

Please keep in mind that my response refers only to activities within the South Carolina Technical Education system. You will have to contact Dr. Duffy regarding the current situation among the two-year branches of the University of South Carolina. If I can provide additional information, don't hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

Ken



Kenneth Kyre, Director
Division of Educational
Services

KK/dt

# Regents of Education

State of South Dakota
State Capitol Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 224-3455

**Members**
John E. (Matt) Sutton, Jr., President, Agar
Leslie W. Jensen, Vice President, Hot Springs
Celia Miner, Secretary, Yankton
John W. Larson, Chamberlain
H. Lauren Lewis, Sioux Falls
Patricia K. Mendel, Doland
Russell O. Peterson, Revillo

**Commissioner of Higher Education**
Robert H. DeZonia, Ph.D.

**Governing Board for**
Black Hills State College
Dakota State College
Northern State College
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
South Dakota State University
University of South Dakota
University of South Dakota at Springfield
School for the Deaf
School for the Visually Handicapped

January 30, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL. 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

Dr. Barnhart, Superintendent of Public Instruction, forwarded your letter of January 20 to this office. We are responsible for all post-secondary education in South Dakota.

We can be of little help to you in your study because South Dakota has no community junior colleges. We believe that this is because South Dakota with its very sparce rural population already has a four-year college or university in every community of the state large enough to support a college of any kind. We do have a number of post-secondary vocational schools and most of our four-year institutions have also developed junior college divisions, but in the sense of the kind of institution your study is concerned with, we have none in South Dakota.

Sincerely yours,

Francis B. Nickerson

Dr. Francis B. Nickerson
Associate Commissioner for Administrative Affairs

FBN:mat

# Coordinating Board

TEXAS COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

P.O. BOX 12788 CAPITOL STATION
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711 (512) 475-3413


January 30, 1975

Ms. P. Einbecker, Assistant
Professor
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Einbecker:

As Dr. Thomas Hatfield is no longer with the staff of the Coordinating Board, your letter of January 20 has been referred to me for response.

The answers to most of your questions may be condensed into a few words, as there is no statewide planning regarding performance objectives for Texas community/junior colleges. There is a legislative mandate to encourage research into innovative and experimental programs, but this could not be construed to mean advocacy of any one instructional mode.

The forty-seven public junior/community colleges in Texas vary in the degree to which they have implemented the use of competency based programs. I am enclosing a list of these colleges, with asterisks indicating those which have developed fine programs incorporating performance objectives. The extent of utilization for these and other experimental modes of instruction is an institutional decision, and policy determination within each institution resides in each college's board of trustees.

Although there is no statewide policy on this issue, I hope this information will prove useful. Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Dr. Sheila C. Tesar

Sheila C. Tesar, Ph.D.
Assistant Director
Community College Programs
Program Development Division

jkh

Enclosure


HARRY PROVENCE, CHAIRMAN; NEWTON GRESHAM, VICE-CHAIRMAN; JACK ARTHUR; ROBERT W. BAKER; TONY BONILLA; G. V. BRINDLEY, JR., M.D.; O. H. ELLIOTT; MARSHALL FORMBY; MRS. JESS HAY; HAROLD D. HERNDON; JAMES P. HOLLERS, D.D.S.; L. B. MEADERS; FRED M. MOORE; RICHARD B. SLOCOMB; WAYNE E. THOMAS; M. HARVEY WEIL; WATSON W. WISE; AND SAM D. YOUNG, JR.; BEVINGTON REED, COMMISSIONER.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

600 Parker Drive
Pensacola, FL 32504
January 20, 1975

85

JAN - 1975

Dr. G. Homer Durham, Commissioner
Utah System of Higher Education
136 East South Temple Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Dr. Durham:

May I ask your help in providing me with past, current, and anticipated state level planning information concerning the preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives in community junior colleges in your state.

As a part of the course requirement in the Nova Ed.D. Program, I am conducting a study which directs itself to what is happening around the nation (in as many states as possible) with performance objectives in education at the state level.

I have collected the usual historical data on performance objectives and I need data that would speak to current, immediate trends and future possibilities (predictive or planned) in the movement toward or away from performance objectives.

General Guideline Questions:

No agreement 1. Are the state level policy making groups and individual community junior college groups in accord (for or against) performance objectives?

No - institutional purgative. 2. Is state level planning demanding that community junior college faculty write performance objectives?

N/A 3. Are faculty rejecting the edict?

N/A 4. Are there any litigations coming from these objectives?

Be specific! 5. In what essential ways does effective community college operation depend upon performance objectives?

See above #2 6. How is the state level accelerating or decelerating the movement toward or away from performance objectives?

Institutional prerogative.. Which officials, agencies, organizations are involved in policy, planning, or formulation toward performance objectives in single community colleges, in multi-campus community junior colleges, in state systems junior colleges, in regional systems community junior colleges, and at the Federal Government level?

Question is too broad to be asking such a little.

I would appreciate your sharing any information that might treat any or all of the general questions listed above. The time limitations on this study prompt me to ask for your quick reply to expedite my finished product.

If this finished document which will compare the state level policies concerning performance objectives could be of any value to your agency, I will provide you with a copy of the abstract.

Sincerely,

P. Einbecker

Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

Your request is very vague.
Responses will be difficult for you to compile.
Best wishes.
Don A. Carpenter, for
Commissioner Durham
1-29-75

92

600 Parker Drive
Pensacola, FL 32504
January 20, 1975

Roger 86

Mr. John C. Mundt, Director
State Board for Community College
Education
319 East 7th Avenue
Olympia, WA 98504

Mr. Mundt:

May I ask your help in providing me with past, current, and anticipated state level planning information concerning the preparation and use of performance or behavioral objectives in community junior colleges in your state.

As a part of the course requirement in the Nova Ed.D. Program, I am conducting a study which directs itself to what is happening around the nation (in as many states as possible) with performance objectives in education at the state level.

I have collected the usual historical data on performance objectives and I need data that would speak to current, immediate trends and future possibilities (predictive or planned) in the movement toward or away from performance objectives.

Dear P.

General Guideline Questions:

Has not been addressed as a state level policy issue.

1. Are the state level policy making groups and individual community junior college groups in accord (for or against) performance objectives?

NO

2. Is state level planning demanding that community junior college faculty write performance objectives?

Seems to depend on how it is presented by campus administrators, but faculty generally resist any edict.

3. Are faculty rejecting the edict?

4. Are there any litigations coming from these objectives?

Not to my knowledge

5. In what essential ways does effective community college operation depend upon performance objectives?

Evaluative efforts, especially in instructional programs, are best based on what the program was supposed to accomplish. A performance statement of some kind provides such a basis.

6. How is the state level accelerating or decelerating the movement toward or away from performance objectives?

7. Which officials, agencies, organizations are involved in policy, planning, or formulation toward performance objectives in single community colleges, in multi-campus community junior colleges, in state systems junior colleges, in regional systems community junior colleges, and at the Federal Government level?

The state board for community colleges is neither encouraging or discouraging it.

I would appreciate your sharing any information that might treat any or all of the general questions listed above. The time limitations on this study prompt me to ask for your quick reply to expedite my finished product.

Any such emphasis exists at the discretion of the 27 separate campuses

If this ~~finished document which will~~ compare the state level policies concerning performance objectives could be of any value to your agency, I will provide you with a copy of the abstract.

yes, please.

Sincerely,

P. Einbecker

Roger Bassett
Asst Director, Planning
State Board for
Community College Educ.



Ms. P. Einbecker, Asst. Prof.
School of Career Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, FL 32504

APPENDIX D

PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE OPINION POLL INSTRUMENT
DESIGNED TO DETERMINE
THE USE, ACCEPTANCE, AND FUNCTION
OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
AT PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE

PJC OPINION POLL (ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY)

Please take just five minutes now, underline your response to each of the 20 items on this poll, and return to P. Einbecker, Bus. Ed. Dept. (self-addressed on back side). If you were not employed at PJC in 1970-71, I would still appreciate your responding to all applicable items. Thank you very much for your help - I need 100% response.

1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives?

   A. unfavorable B. neutral C. favorable

2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives?

   A. none B. limited C. extensive

3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project?

   A. less than adequate B. adequate C. more than adequate

4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline?

   A. unfavorable B. neutral C. favorable

5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in the content and structure of your courses?

   A. unfavorable B. neutral C. favorable

6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives?

   A. none B. limited C. extensive

7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives?

   A. unfavorable B. neutral C. favorable

8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year?

   A. none B. few C. many

9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation?

   A. negative effect B. no effect C. positive effect

10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods?

    A. negative effect B. no effect C. positive effect

11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of objectives in your courses?

A. negative effect B. no effect C. positive effect

12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures?

A. no B. neutral C. yes

13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field?

A. no B. neutral C. yes

14. Do you forsee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives?

A. no B. neutral C. yes

15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives?

A. no B. neutral C. yes

16. Do you feel that performance objectives help you to improve <u>your</u> selection of objectives and thereby improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students?

A. no B. neutral C. yes

17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives is in any way equal to the time and effort that you spend in preparation and up-grading them?

A. no B. neutral C. yes

18. Do you believe that the <u>writing and up-grading</u> of performance objectives should be a voluntary decision by individual faculty members?

A. yes B. neutral C. no

19. Do you believe that the <u>writing and up-grading</u> of performance objectives should be abolished altogether as another educational fad?

A. yes B. neutral C. no

20. Where do you believe that the mandate for performance objectives originates?

A. individual institution B. state level C. national level

<u>ADMINISTRATORS</u>

Degrees you hold _____
Number of years experience
Teaching _____
Administrative _____
Major Teaching Field _____

<u>FACULTY MEMBERS</u>

Degrees you hold _____
Number of years experience
Teaching _____
Administrative _____
Major Teaching Field _____

Any additional comments you wish to make: _____

# APPENDIX E

## TABLES REPORTING THE TABULATED RESULTS OF SIMPLE CORRELATION STUDY DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE USE, ACCEPTANCE, AND FUNCTION OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AT PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE

TABLE I

MEAN RESPONSES - Disciplines Represented vs. Faculty Attitudes

Unfavorable Response = 1.00
Neutral Response = 2.00
Favorable Response = 3.00

N=163

| Opinion Poll Items | Exact Science N=26 | Lang. & FA N=27 | Social Science N=13 | Health Related N=32 | Voc. Tech. N=41 | Adult Ed. N=24 | All Depts. N=163 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 2.08 | 1.67 | 1.38 | 1.56 | 1.78 | 1.54 | 1.71 |
| 2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? | 1.73 | 1.67 | 1.54 | 1.63 | 1.78 | 1.63 | 1.70 |
| 3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? | 1.58 | 1.41 | 0.92 | 1.41 | 1.44 | 1.29 | 1.40 |
| 4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline? | 2.69 | 2.33 | 2.23 | 2.09 | 2.56 | 2.13 | 2.32 |
| 5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in your courses? | 2.88 | 2.78 | 2.77 | 2.50 | 2.71 | 2.54 | 2.65 |
| 6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives? | 2.65 | 2.22 | 2.15 | 2.19 | 2.51 | 2.25 | 2.36 |
| 7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 2.85 | 2.15 | 1.92 | 2.13 | 2.59 | 2.00 | 2.30 |
| 8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? | 2.73 | 2.56 | 2.31 | 2.38 | 2.44 | 2.42 | 2.47 |

TABLE I - Continued

| Opinion Poll Items | Exact Science | Lang. & FA | Social Science | Health Related | Voc. Tech. | Adult Ed. | All Depts. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation? | 2.85 | 2.67 | 2.23 | 2.44 | 2.61 | 2.29 | 2.52 |
| 10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods? | 2.85 | 2.63 | 2.31 | 2.53 | 2.59 | 2.38 | 2.54 |
| 11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of your course objectives? | 2.96 | 2.74 | 2.31 | 2.34 | 2.76 | 2.50 | 2.61 |
| 12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? | 2.96 | 2.33 | 1.92 | 2.19 | 2.49 | 2.33 | 2.38 |
| 13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field? | 2.65 | 2.11 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.17 | 2.00 | 2.1 |
| 14. Do you foresee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 2.69 | 2.15 | 2.46 | 2.00 | 2.41 | 2.21 | 2.28 |
| 15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 2.81 | 2.37 | 2.46 | 1.91 | 2.39 | 2.25 | 2.31 |
| 16. Do you feel that performance objectives help to improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students? | 2.88 | 2.30 | 2.31 | 2.19 | 2.46 | 2.38 | 2.39 |
| 17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? | 2.85 | 2 15 | 1.92 | 2.09 | 2.29 | 2.25 | 2.24 |
| 18. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be faculty members' voluntary decision? | 1.69 | 1.26 | 1.69 | 1.59 | 1.93 | 1.63 | 1.62 |
| 19. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be abolished as another educational fad? | 2.65 | 2.07 | 2.08 | 2.03 | 2.54 | 2.17 | 2.26 |

TABLE II

RANK ORDER OF MEANS - Disciplines Represented vs. Faculty Attitudes

Lowest Rank = 1
Highest Rank = 6

| Opinion Poll Items | Exact Science | Lang. & FA | Social Science | Health Related | Voc. Tech. | Adult Ed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 6* | 4 | 1** | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? | 5 | 4 | 1** | 2-tie | 6* | 2-tie |
| 3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? | 6* | 3-tie | 1** | 3-tie | 5 | 2 |
| 4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline? | 6* | 4 | 3 | 1** | 5 | 2 |
| 5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in your courses? | 6* | 5 | 4 | 1** | 3 | 2 |
| 6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives? | 6* | 3 | 1** | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| 7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 6* | 4 | 1** | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? | 6* | 5 | 1** | 2 | 4 | 3 |

* Highest ** Lowest

TABLE II - Continued

| Opinion Poll Items | Exact Science | Lang. & FA | Social Science | Health Related | Voc. Tech. | Adult Ed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation? | 6* | 5 | 1** | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods? | 6* | 5 | 1** | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of your course objectives? | 6* | 4 | 1** | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? | 6* | 3-tie | 1** | 2 | 5 | 3-tie |
| 13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field? | 6* | 4 | 1-tie** | 1-tie** | 5 | 1-tie** |
| 14. Do you foresee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 6* | 2 | 5 | 1** | 4 | 3 |
| 15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 6* | 3 | 5 | 1** | 4 | 2 |
| 16. Do you feel that performance objectives help to improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students? | 6* | 2 | 3 | 1** | 5 | 4 |
| 17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? | 6* | 3 | 1** | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| 18. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be faculty members' voluntary decision? | 4-tie | 1** | 4-tie | 2 | 6* | 3 |
| 19. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be abolished as another educational fad? | 6* | 2 | 3 | 1** | 5 | 4 |

TABLE III

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS - Degrees Held vs. Faculty Attitudes

Negative Correlations < Degrees High and Opinion Low; Degrees Low and Opinion High

Positive Correlations < Degrees High and Opinion High; Degrees Low and Opinion Low

| Opinion Poll Items | Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Degrees Held |
|---|---|
| 1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | -0.057 |
| 2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? | -0.001 |
| 3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? | -0.080 |
| 4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline? | -0.116 |
| 5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in your courses? | -0.115 |
| 6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives? | -0.164* |
| 7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | -0.177* |
| 8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? | -0.093 |

* Significant at the .05 Level

TABLE III - Continued

| Opinion Poll Items | Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Degrees Held |
|---|---|
| 9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation? | -0.088 |
| 10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods? | -0.104 |
| 11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of your course objectives? | -0.137 |
| 12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? | -0.183 * |
| 13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field? | -0.148 |
| 14. Do you foresee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | -0.079 |
| 15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | -0.073 |
| 16. Do you feel that performance objectives help to improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students? | -0.206 * |
| 17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? | -0.177 * |
| 18. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be faculty members' voluntary decision? | -0.046 |
| 19. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be abolished as another educational fad? | -0.132 |

TABLE IV

RANK ORDER OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS - Degrees Held vs. Faculty Attitudes

Negative Correlations < Degrees High and Opinion Low; Degrees Low and Opinion High

Positive Correlations < Degrees High and Opinion High; Degrees Low and Opinion Low

| Opinion Poll Items | Rank Order of Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Degrees Held |
|---|---|
| 1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 3 |
| 2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? | 1** |
| 3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? | 6 |
| 4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline? | 11 |
| 5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in your courses? | 10 |
| 6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives? | 15 |
| 7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 16 tie |
| 8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? | 8 |

* Highest ** Lowest Negative Correlation

Positive Correlation (none)

TABLE IV - Continued

| Opinion Poll Items | Rank Order of Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Degrees Held |
|---|---|
| 9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation? | 7 |
| 10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods? | 9 |
| 11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of your course objectives? | 13 |
| 12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? | 18 |
| 13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field? | 14 |
| 14. Do you foresee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 5 |
| 15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 4 |
| 16. Do you feel that performance objectives help to improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students? | 19 * |
| 17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? | 16 tie |
| 18. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be faculty members' voluntary decision? | 2 |
| 19. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be abolished as another educational fad? | 12 |

TABLE V

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS - Years of Teaching Experience vs. Faculty Attitudes

Negative Correlations — Years of Experience High and Opinion Low; Years of Experience Low and Opinion High

Positive Correlations — Years of Experience High and Opini High; Years of Experience Low and Opini Low

| Opinion Poll Items | Correlations of responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Years of Teaching Experience |
|---|---|
| 1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 0.231* |
| 2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? | 0.300* |
| 3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? | 0.319* |
| 4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline? | 0.120 |
| 5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in your courses? | 0.039 |
| 6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives? | 0.100 |
| 7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 0.164* |
| 8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? | 0.120 |

*Significant at the .05 Level

TABLE V - (Continued

| Opinion Poll Items | Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Years of Teaching Experience |
|---|---|
| 9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation? | -0.013 |
| 10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods? | 0.054 |
| 11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of your course objectives? | -0.038 |
| 12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? | 0.039 |
| 13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field? | 0.083 |
| 14. Do you foresee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | -0.102 |
| 15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | -0.150* |
| 16. Do you feel that performance objectives help to improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students? | 0.015 |
| 17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? | -0.016 |
| 18. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be faculty members' voluntary decision? | -0.039 |
| 19. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be abolished as another educational fad? | -0.023 |

TABLE VI

RANK ORDER OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS - Years of Teaching Experience vs. Faculty Attitudes

Negative Correlations: Years of Experience High and Opinion Low; Years of Experience Low and Opinion High

Positive Correlations: Years of Experience High and Opini High; Years of Experience Low and Opini Low

| Opinion Poll Items | Rank Order of Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Years Teaching Exp. |
|---|---|
| 1. When you undertook the writing of syllabuses for your courses in 1970-71, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 9 (positive) |
| 2. When the project was undertaken, how would you have rated your knowledge of performance objectives? | 10(positive) |
| 3. How would you rate the help that was provided during this project? | 11(positive) * |
| 4. Now, four years later 1974-75, what is your attitude about writing performance objectives for your discipline? | 6 tie (positive) |
| 5. Do you believe that you should up-grade your syllabuses, as you have been required to do, to reflect changes in your courses? | 1 tie (positive)** |
| 6. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, how would you rate your knowledge of performance objectives? | 5 (positive) |
| 7. At the conclusion of up-grading your syllabuses, what was your attitude about performance objectives? | 8 (positive) |
| 8. How many times do you refer to your objectives in lesson preparation during the academic year? | 6 tie (positive) |

* Highest Highest

** Lowest Lowest

Negative Correlation
Positive Correlation

TABLE VI - Continued

| Opinion Poll Items | Rank Order of Correlations of Responses to Opinion Poll Items to Number of Years Teaching Exp. |
|---|---|
| 9. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your exam preparation? | 1 (negative) ** |
| 10. What effect has the availability of performance objectives had on your teaching methods? | 3 (positive) |
| 11. What effect has the writing and up-grading of performance objectives had on your understanding of your course objectives? | 5 (negative) |
| 12. Have performance objectives encouraged exploratory use of materials, methods, or criterion measures? | 1 tie (positive) ** |
| 13. Have performance objectives caused you to focus more upon the student than upon your subject field? | 4 (positive) |
| 14. Do you foresee an increased possibility for student-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 7 (negative) |
| 15. Do you foresee an increased possibility for teacher-evaluation through the use of performance objectives? | 8 (negative) * |
| 16. Do you feel that performance objectives help to improve the quality of skills being mastered by the students? | 2 (negative) |
| 17. Do you feel that the value of performance objectives in any way equals the effort that you expend in preparation of them? | 3 (negative) |
| 18. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be faculty members' voluntary decision? | 6 (negative) |
| 19. Do you believe that the writing and up-grading of performance objectives should be abolished as another educational fad? | 4 (negative) |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
JUL 3 1975
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION